DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 163 CE 001 665

AUTHOR	Mezirow, Jack; Irish, Gladys
TITLE	Priorities for Experimentation and Development in Adult Basic Education. Vol. I of Planning for Innovation in Adult Basic Education. Center Research Report No. 2.
INSTITUTION	Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Center for Adult Education.
REPORT NO	CRR-2
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	217p.; For related document, see CE 002 455
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$10.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; Adult Educators; Demonstration Projects; *Educational Needs; Educational Planning; Educational Research; *National Surveys; Needs; Pilot Projects; Planning; Program Development; Program Planning; *Statistical Analysis
IDENTIFIERS	*Priorities

ABSTRACT

Researchers at Columbia University's Center for Adult Education, using a survey questionnaire delineating a comprehensive range of program areas and specific activities within each area, determined priorities for Adult Basic Education (ABE) Special Projects. The instrument sought the needs and preferences of those most directly involved in carrying out Title III ABE programs: teachers; local, State and regional program directors; staff development directors; and selected professors of adult education. The data obtained from several national surveys utilizing this instrument is presented and analyzed in the document. Highest priority items are identified for all groups of respondents; cross tabulations determine priorities of given subpopulations and the significance of differences among subpopulations. Sample groups are compared (e.g., State versus local directors), as are the priorities of directors from different regions and program type. Clusters of priorities are determined for certain subgroups, correlation matrices established, and correlated priorities determined for the highest priority items. The analysis was undertaken to suggest special projects that could be designed to meet a number of high priority needs simultaneously. (AJ)

ED 094163

Center Research Report No. 2

PRIORITIES FOR EXPERIMENTATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Jack Mezirow
Gladys Irish

Volume I

of

P L A N N I N G for I N N O V A T I O N

IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

A Study Directed by Jack Mezirow

-1974-

CE 001 665

Center for Adult Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

We gratefully acknowledge the valued collaboration of Catherine Crone, who served as research assistant on this study, Professor Gordon Darkenwald who provided consultant help, Fran Smith who edited the manuscript with the aid of Louise Paul, and Hildegard Piesch who typed it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	1
I	PRIORITIES OF LOCAL ABE DIRECTORS	8
II	PRIORITIES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS IN URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL PROGRAMS	20
III	PRIORITY CLUSTERS OF LOCAL DIRECTORS IN URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL PROGRAMS	25
IV	PRIORITIES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS - REGIONAL DIFFERENCES	47
V	PRIORITIES OF ABE TEACHERS	59
VI	PRIORITY CLUSTERS OF TEACHERS IN BASIC EDUCATION AND ESL PROGRAMS	73
VII	PRIORITIES OF STATE DIRECTORS	84
VIII	PRIORITIES OF REGIONAL STAFF	101
IX	PRIORITIES OF SPECIAL PROJECT DIRECTORS AND PROFESSORS OF ADULT EDUCATION	109
X	PRIORITIES OF THE CONSULTANT WORKSHOP	123
Appendix I		
I-A	URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL DIRECTORS COMPARED: HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS	146
I-B	CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS	154
I-C	CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS	167
Appendix II		
II-A	QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE: LOCAL DIRECTORS AND TEACHERS	177
II-B	FACSIMILE OF LOCAL DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE: MARGINALS	183
II-C	FACSIMILE OF TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE: MARGINALS	195

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

The Adult Education Act of 1966 (Title III, Sec. 309(b), Elementary and Secondary Education Act) provides for the use of discretionary funds by the U.S. Office of Education for Special Experimental Demonstration Projects which "involve the use of innovative methods, systems, materials or programs . . . or involve a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of persons with basic educational deficiencies." In 1972 grants of nearly six million dollars supported forty-one Special Projects in adult basic education (ABE) undertaken by public school systems, universities, and other private organizations. These grants were distributed among four program priority categories: urban, rural migrant, special population, and resource development. As indicated in Volume II of this study, Special Projects have included: (1) experimental development of instructional and delivery systems; (2) development and demonstration of improved program practices and products; (3) development projects to meet the needs of selected local programs; (4) studies of the disadvantaged learner and ABE's target population; and (5) policy planning studies. In the past there has been no systematic way to gear priority-setting in the allocation of 309(b) funds to the expressed needs of those who bear the most direct responsibility for program operation on local, state, and regional levels.

Purpose of the Study

Researchers at the Center for Adult Education undertook to design and demonstrate the use of a strategy for determining priorities for Special Projects. This strategy was based upon the expressed needs and preferences of those most directly involved in carrying out Title III ABE programs: the teachers, local program directors, state directors, regional program officers, regional staff development project directors, and 309(b) Special Project directors, as well as selected professors of adult education directly involved in ABE programs. This work was undertaken in 1973.

The strategy involved the delineation of a comprehensive range of program areas and of specific program activities within each area. These were embodied in an ABE Priorities Survey Questionnaire, with different versions appropriate to different groups of ABE practitioners. For each program area, respondents from each professional group could indicate the degree of priority they assigned to experimental and demonstration efforts designed to improve implementation of specific program activities. Each respondent was asked to reply, not in a theoretical way, but in terms of his own program.

To supplement the highly specific, operations-oriented data derived from the several national surveys utilizing this instrument, a Consultant's Workshop on National Priorities for Demonstration and Experimentation in Adult Basic Education was conducted at Columbia University on June 8, 1973. A distinguished and broadly representative group of 20 consultants met to consider the broad questions of national, research, policy, and planning dimensions of ABE and their implications for experimental and demonstration projects.

Questionnaire Design

The Center for Adult Education's last three years of comprehensive, national program analyses of the national ABE effort provided important data for identifying major program areas - needs, problems, and concerns. The Center's experience included field studies in more than 40 programs across the country, several national questionnaire survey analyses, regional workshops for directors, and the production of a program evaluation guide.*

We were able to identify seven major program areas requiring important decision-making by directors and planners: recruitment, in-service education, instruction, instructional materials, program management, counseling, and collaboration with other agencies. For ABE teachers, we identified seven areas of possible decision-making as well: recruitment, in-service education, instruction, instructional materials, use of paraprofessionals, counseling, and learning laboratories. These critical areas of decision-making became sections of a fifteen-page questionnaire for directors and a fourteen-page questionnaire for teachers. (See Appendix II)

In the area of Target Groups, for example, each local director was asked to indicate the "priority of need" for his program for projects which would find or demonstrate more effective ways to reach and educate sixteen possible target groups (e.g., Blacks, rural adults,

---

*Alan B. Knox, Jack D. Mezirow, Gordon G. Darkenwald, and Harold Beder. An Evaluation Guide for Adult Basic Education Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

least literate, etc.). Priorities were ranked as: Not Applicable, Low, Medium, High, and Highest. In addition, each director was instructed to indicate the one of the sixteen target groups which he would rate as TOP Priority. The same format was used to rate 20 Selected Practices (provision for child care facilities, co-sponsored classes, employment of paraprofessionals, employment of full-time staff, etc.); 24 Program Management Concerns (develop interagency referrals, use PPBS, coordinate with other ABE programs, etc.); 21 items on Recruitment; 25 items on In-Service Education; 25 items on Instruction; and 19 items on Instructional Materials. Directors were also asked to answer 25 questions pertaining to themselves and their programs.

Teachers were similarly asked about 45 items relating to Instruction. Each teacher was required to indicate the "priority of need" he/she feels for projects which would find or demonstrate more effective ways for teachers to, for example: diagnose student learning needs, orient new students to program, minimize disruption due to continuous enrollment of new students, etc. There were also 56 items to be rated pertaining to In-Service Education, 15 on Counseling, 31 on Instructional Materials, 10 items on Paraprofessionals, and 16 on Learning Laboratories.

Survey Population

The names of local Title III program directors were obtained from the office of each of the state directors of ABE of the continental United States. One half of the directors in each state received a

copy of the ABE priorities survey. (The other half of the directors received a Center survey instrument concerning the adoption and dissemination of innovative practices and products, the results of which are reported in Volume II of this report.) Approximately 1,200 local ABE directors received the survey instrument, and two follow-up reminders were mailed as required. Responses were received from 776 (65%) of the directors.

Detailed information on the response rate is presented in Appendix II. Two main points are presented here. First, the lists of local directors received from the state offices varied in quality. Some were more current than others; some listed only Title III programs in the state; some included directors of other adult education programs funded through the state office without differentiation. Where the latter was the case, response rates were lower because individuals who received a questionnaire were not ABE personnel. Second, the names of state ABE directors were secured from the Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education (BAVTE), U.S. Office of Education. Questionnaires were sent to all directors and 37 of 48 (77%) state directors in the continental United States responded. Each of the ten Regional Program Officers and ten Regional Staff Development directors were polled. Eight RPO's and seven Staff Development directors responded.

The names of 309(b) Project directors for the years of 1970, 1971, and 1972 derived from records made available by BAVTE. In many cases, these projects were no longer in existence, and their staffs had scattered. However, of 93 Special Experimental or Demonstration

Project directors identified, 43 (46%) responded to the ABE Priorities Survey.

The membership list of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education was used as the marking list for professors of adult education. Respondents were asked to reply only if they had recently worked directly with the Title III program or had other relevant experience with adult basic education. Forty-five of 130 (35%) professors who were polled responded.

A national sample of ABE teachers was obtained by writing to a random sample of 10% of all directors of local Title III programs and requesting lists of teachers in their programs. Directors were given the choice of distributing questionnaires through their program or of providing home addresses where questionnaires could be mailed. Two hundred sixty-one directors were sent requests for lists, and 138 responded. Using these lists, the teacher version of the ABE priorities survey instruments was sent to 1,121 teachers in Title III programs. 448 (40%) of these teachers responded. A detailed breakdown of the teacher sample and teacher response patterns by region and state is available in Appendix II.

Data Analysis

For all groups surveyed, marginals were run, using both the full five-category priority rating (not applicable, low priority, medium priority, high priority, highest priority) and a collapsed scale (not applicable, low priority, high priority). Highest priority items were identified for all groups of respondents.

There is an important distinction between HIGH and TOP priority as reported in subsequent chapters. HIGH is a collapsing of two categories: High priority and Highest priority. TOP represents the one item that the respondent chooses as his single highest priority among all items in that program area.

Cross tabulations were used extensively with the chi-square statistics at the .05 level of probability to determine priorities of given subpopulations and the significance of differences among subpopulations. Sample groups were compared (e.g., state vs. local directors), as were the priorities of directors from different regions and program type.

Clusters of priorities were determined for certain subgroups of directors and teachers, correlation matrices established, and correlated priorities identified for the highest priority items. The analysis was undertaken to suggest Special Projects that could be designed to meet a number of high priority needs simultaneously.

CHAPTER I

PRIORITIES OF LOCAL ABE DIRECTORS

The following summary tables are largely self-explanatory. They present the items most frequently designated by local directors as HIGH or TOP priority. This chapter will follow the organization of the survey, which was divided into the following sections, each one a program area:

I. General Priorities
II. Target Group
III. Selected Practices
IV. Program Management
V. Recruitment
VI. In-Service Education
VII. Instruction
VIII. Instructional Materials

A HIGH priority item is included in these summary tables only if it has been so designated by at least 60% of the respondents; the arbitrary minimum for the inclusion of a TOP priority item is at least 12 1/2% (one-eighth of all respondents). It should be remembered that "HIGH" is a collapsing of two categories, High priority and Highest priority, and that "TOP" represents the one item that the respondent chooses as his single highest priority among all items in the program area.

General Priorities

Table 1 refers to local directors' choices regarding General Priorities. Other items surveyed by this section of the questionnaire but not meeting the criteria for inclusion in this report can be found in the facsimile of the Director Questionnaire, included in Appendix II.

In the General Priorities section, directors were asked to indicate the "priority of need for your program for projects to find or demonstrate more effective practices in each of these program areas . . ." Two program areas were accorded HIGH (High or Highest) priority from 60% or more of directors. These were recruitment, with 78.2% HIGH priority ratings, and instruction, with 65.4% HIGH ratings. Asked to identify the single highest (TOP) priority program area, half the respondents indicated recruitment as the TOP priority and about one-fifth designated instruction as the TOP priority.

In responding to individual items in other sections of the questionnaire, directors most frequently assigned HIGH priority to items in sections concerned with instruction, in-service education, and instructional materials. It is interesting to note, however, that relatively few items in the section specifically devoted to Recruitment got HIGH priority ratings from large numbers of directors.

Table 1

GENERAL PRIORITIES
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N ≃ 750)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 489)
Recruitment	78.2	50.5
Instruction	65.4	19.3

Target Group

Directors were asked to assign priority ratings indicating "the priority of need for your program to find or demonstrate more effective ways to reach and educate the following . . . ." The intention of this question was to go beyond the problem of recruitment to identify concern with effectively motivating, retaining, and educating specified groups of students. Target populations included ethnic (e.g., Blacks), economic (e.g., unemployed) and residential (e.g., rural) groups, with obvious overlap in membership.

The highest priority target group was the unemployed; 67.3 percent of respondents placed HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to reach and educate this group. Other high priority groups designated were: the least literate, rural adults, and welfare recipients.

An overriding concern with serving rural adults was dramatized by the large numbers of directors who indicated this as their TOP priority target group. One-fifth of all directors see this as the TOP priority. Among directors with largely rural target populations, this concentration of concern is, of course, even greater. Other groups which were assigned TOP priority by over one-eighth of directors nationally were the least literate and Blacks, with 15% each.

The unemployed, least literate, and welfare recipients comprise the hard core target groups which directors feel they are unsuccessful in reaching effectively. Directors have as their paramount concern finding better means of getting these participants into their programs, and providing effective educational experiences to help

them once there. This finding confirms the earlier national study by the Center for Adult Education which revealed that these target groups were not represented in ABE programs in proportion to their numbers in the population of undereducated adults.

Table 2

TARGET GROUPS
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N ≃ 750)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 502)
Unemployed	67.3	-*
Least Literate	65.1	15.3
Rural Adults	60.4	20.1
Welfare Recipients	59.8	-*
Blacks	-*	14.7

*Percentage did not meet minimum criteria for reporting: 60+% HIGH and 12.5+% TOP.

Selected Practices

Directors were asked to indicate the "priority you would assign experimental projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of these practices." Twenty practices were included; for a complete list the reader should consult Appendix II. Included were such practices as the provision of child care facilities, instruction in "coping" skills, emphasis on beginning level classes, and the employment of full-time recruiters.

Three practices were of HIGH priority to over 60% of directors. Concentration on the hardest to reach target groups received the greatest proportion of HIGH priority ratings with 70.3%. This is consistent with the priority given to reaching the least literate and unemployed in the previous section. Integration of ABE and GED programs is of HIGH priority for 64.9% of directors. This is consistent with earlier Center findings that many ABE students have the GED diploma as a major objective and place great importance on a high school diploma for seeking employment. Provision of vocational counseling and job placement services is a HIGH priority for demonstration for 60.9% of the directors. This again is consistent with the directors' concern in reaching and retaining the unemployed and least literate.

Table 3

SELECTED PRACTICES
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N = 750)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 489)
Concentration on Hardest to Reach Target Groups	70.3	16.8
Integration of ABE and GED Programs	64.9	18.2
Provision of Vocational Counseling and Job Placement Services	60.9	-

Program Management

This section of the questionnaire contained 23 items pertaining to program management. Included were: selection of competent classroom teachers, coordination of Title III with other ABE and related programs, and development of counseling services. For a complete list, the reader should consult Appendix II. Directors were asked to indicate the "priority of need for your program to find or demonstrate more effective ways" to carry out these program management functions.

Four items were of HIGH priority to over 60% of directors. The item most frequently designated as HIGH was: increase community support for the ABE program. Seventy-two percent of directors gave this HIGH priority and over 14% singled it out as the TOP priority item in the section. Evaluate overall program effectiveness was the second highest management item with over 65% HIGH ratings and over 13% of directors nominating it as the TOP priority item. Other items receiving large proportions of HIGH ratings were: obtain additional resources to supplement existing funds and involve staff in setting program goals and priorities.

Table 4

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N = 715)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 473)
Increase Community Support for the ABE Program	72.8	14.2
Evaluate Overall Program Effectiveness	65.7	13.7
Obtain Additional Resources to Supplement Existing Funds	61.5	-
Involve Staff in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	61.5	-

Recruitment

There were two types of items in the section of the questionnaire dealing with recruitment. The first items concerned the process of recruitment and included such items as: evaluate the student recruitment effort, use paraprofessionals as recruiters, and use television and radio spots. The second set of items listed specific target groups and paralled the earlier section of the questionnaire devoted to target groups. Directors were asked to assign priorities to items based on the needs of their own program.

Four specific target groups and one recruitment process received over 60% HIGH priority ratings. Almost 70% of directors place a HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective ways to work through other agencies to recruit students. The two highest priority groups for recruitment were again the unemployed (77% HIGH) and the least literate (71% HIGH). These priorities are consistent with those reported earlier. Rural adults are a HIGH priority target group for 62% of directors overall (and for 88% of rural directors). More effective recruitment of young males is a HIGH priority for 61% of directors.

Table 5

RECRUITMENT
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N = 750)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 455)
Recruit Unemployed	76.5	-
Recruit Most Illiterate	71.4	21.5
Work through Other Agencies to Recruit Students	69.8	-
Recruit Rural Adults	61.7	-
Recruit Young Males	60.9	-

In-Service Education

The In-Service Education section contained several different types of items concerned with: (1) the process of providing in-service education, (2) alternative format for in-service education, (3) participants in in-service education, and (4) content of in-service programs.

More effective ways to provide in-service education for teachers are HIGH for 80% of the directors. Provision of in-service education for other staff members -- paraprofessionals, counselors, and supervisors -- is not of high priority. More effective use of local workshops in in-service education is of HIGH priority for 64% of directors. More effective use of other types of in-service activities, e.g., state and regional programs and university courses, are of lower priority.

Five content areas received HIGH priority ratings from over two-thirds of directors. The following are the areas in which directors

feel the greatest need to provide more effective in-service education for ABE teachers: (1) diagnosis of student learning needs (78% HIGH), (2) instructional methods (72% HIGH), (3) evaluation of student achievement (69% HIGH), (4) adult learning and development (69% HIGH), and (5) instructional materials (selecting, adapting, and using) (68% HIGH). The first three content areas are confirmed by directors' stated priorities in the section on Instruction. All of these content areas are important because working with undereducated adults involves a different approach to the problems of diagnosis, teaching, and evaluation than that used in classes for children, which constitute the experience of most teachers in ABE programs. Improved in-service education concerning diagnosis of student learning needs is the single TOP item for almost one out of five directors.

Table 6

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N = 710)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 459)
Provide In-service Education for Teachers	80.7	-
In-service Education Concerning Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	78.2	18.5
In-service Education Concerning Instructional Methods	71.8	-
In-service Education Concerning Evaluation of Student Achievement	69.3	-
In-service Education Concerning Adult Learning and Development	68.9	-
In-service Education Concerning Instructional Materials	68.3	-
Use Local Workshops as Part of the In-service Effort	63.6	-

Instruction

There were four items in the Instruction section of HIGH priority for over four-fifths of directors. Another five were of HIGH priority for over three-fifths of the respondents. This is the largest concentration of HIGH priority ratings assigned by directors.

Finding more effective ways to prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs is a HIGH priority item for 83% of directors. This substantiates their expression of concern for more effective in-service education in the area of instructional methods as well as diagnosis of student learning needs. Demonstrating more effective ways to diagnose student learning needs is of HIGH priority (80%) for directors, and more effective use of methods appropriate to adults is a HIGH priority concern for 75% of directors.

Three interrelated concerns -- building student self-confidence, increasing student motivation, and retaining students in the program -- are of HIGH priority for Special Projects for over four-fifths of directors. These concerns are clearly related to their concerns about diagnosis, choice of learning activities, and evaluation insofar as these activities determine what experiences the student has in the classroom.

Finding or demonstrating more effective ways to evaluate the instructional program is of HIGH priority to two-thirds of directors. They want to be able to see what is going well and what needs to be improved in order to increase the effectiveness of their program. The Center's An Evaluation Guide for Adult Basic Education Programs has just been published in response to this need.

The evaluation of student progress is a high priority area of

concern for directors. Three-fifths assign a HIGH priority rating to this area for experimental and demonstration projects. It is clearly related to the concern for more effective ways to diagnose student learning needs.

Three-fifths of directors place a HIGH priority on more effective ways to key the curriculum to behavioral objectives. This may be in terms of more precise specification of objectives to facilitate the prescription of learning activities and evaluation of student progress. It may also refer to more functional, behavioral objectives for the ABE instructional program.

Table 7

INSTRUCTION
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N = 710)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 460)
Prescribe Learning Activities to meet Individual Needs	83.2	-
Build Student Self-confidence	82.6	-
Retain Students in Program	81.5	17.8
Increase Student Motivation	80.5	-
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	79.2	-
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	74.5	-
Evaluate Instructional Program	66.8	-
Evaluate Student Progress	62.2	-
Key Curriculum to Behavioral Objectives	60.3	-

Instructional Materials

Directors were asked to assign priorities for two different types of concerns pertaining to Instructional Materials. The first group of items dealt with identifying, selecting, adapting and developing materials. The second group of items dealt with developing materials in specific curriculum areas (e.g., levels of reading and mathematics, consumer education, ethnic heritage).

Two items in the area of materials utilization were of HIGH priority for over three-fifths of directors. They were: (1) provide dependable information on quality and applicability of available materials (66% HIGH), and (2) adapt materials for local use (62% HIGH).

Almost 70% of directors place a HIGH priority on development of materials in both beginning and intermediate reading levels (1-3 and 4-6). The other area in which improved materials is a HIGH priority for over three-fifths of directors is consumer education.

Table 8

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
LOCAL TITLE III DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N = 705)	TOP PRIORITY (N = 442)
Develop Materials in Beginning Reading	69.5	17.9
Develop Materials in Intermediate Reading	68.9	-
Provide Dependable Information on Quality and Applicability of Instructional Materials	65.7	13.6
Develop Materials in Consumer Education	64.4	-
Adapt Materials for Local Use	61.6	-

CHAPTER II

PRIORITIES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS IN URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL PROGRAMS

All local directors responding to the ABE Priorities Survey completed a section on background information. This section provided information concerning the director himself as well as the local program. Directors were asked a number of questions concerning characteristics of the students enrolled in their programs. If a director reported that 50% or more of his students were in English as a Second Language classes, the program was considered an ESL program in the following analysis. If there were less than 50% ESL students, it was considered a basic education program. A basic education program with two-thirds or more urban students was defined as an urban basic education program; a program with two-thirds or more rural students was considered to be a rural basic education program. In the discussion below, the designations "urban," "rural," and "ESL" refer to these three program types. There were 232 urban program included, 215 rural programs, and 106 ESL programs.

Appendix I-A contains a set of tables which report the HIGH priority items for directors of each type of program -- urban, rural, and ESL. For any program type, an item is included in these tables if 60% or more of directors responding rated the item to be of HIGH (High or Highest) priority.

Only particularly interesting clusters of priorities or differences among groups will be discussed. Insofar as priorities for

a given type of program are the same as those noted in the previous section on overall national priorities, they will not be discussed here.

Urban Basic Education Programs

Directors from urban basic education programs express greater concern with developing more effective ways of providing educational services for the hardest to reach than directors of rural or ESL programs. In the section of the questionnaire concerning Selected Practices, one-fourth of urban directors responding indicated this as their TOP priority item. In addition, in assigning priority ratings for ways to improve services to specific target groups, urban directors assigned a higher priority than directors of other types of programs to the least literate and the unemployed. However, this does not mean that urban directors want to develop specially designed programs for specific target groups; this was not assigned a HIGH priority. In terms of recruitment as well as better service, urban directors placed a HIGH priority on finding better ways to relate to the least literate, the unemployed, Blacks, and welfare recipients.

Urban directors placed a higher priority on making program evaluation more effective than did directors from rural or ESL programs. They are also more concerned with the problem of selecting competent teachers. On the other hand, as a General Priority item, fewer urban directors see improved in-service education as a TOP or HIGH priority area than do rural and ESL program directors.

For urban directors the provision of vocational counseling and job placement is a HIGH priority concern, as is improved placement of

students in jobs and training programs. Urban directors place a higher priority on improving their ability to recruit and educate the unemployed in the first place. In the area of materials development, urban directors place a higher priority than do other directors on the need to develop more effective adult-oriented materials in consumer education and "coping" skills.

For urban directors, all aspects of developing, identifying, and adapting materials are HIGH priority concerns. They would like more help in identifying materials which are currently available, especially dependable information concerning the quality and applicability of these materials. One of ten urban directors felt that the most urgent problem (i.e., TOP priority) in connection with materials development was the development of new materials locally to meet local needs, while one of eight saw provision of dependable information concerning existing materials as the TOP priority need.

Rural Basic Education Programs

Rural directors nationally place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to recruit and meet the educational needs of rural students. They are more concerned with the unique requirements of rural students as a distinct group than are urban directors with urban students per se.

The integration of adult basic education and high school equivalency programs, or at least their coordination, is a HIGH priority concern for rural directors. This is less true for urban or ESL program directors.

Rural program directors share a number of concerns with urban basic education program directors that are not shared by directors of predominantly ESL programs. Among these are the provision of vocational counseling and placement for students as well as the development of improved materials in consumer education. Recruiting and educating the unemployed is more important to basic education directors than to ESL directors. The provision of transportation for students is a HIGH priority item for over one-third of basic education directors, both urban and rural, and the TOP Selected Practice item for 7% of each of the latter two groups. Like urban basic education directors, rural directors do not place a HIGH priority on developing special programs to meet the needs of specific groups of students.

Rural directors, like urban directors assign HIGH priority to improving the dependability of information concerning the quality and applicability of instructional materials. They would also like to be better able to adapt available materials for local use. They place a HIGH priority on in-service education in the area of better selection, adaptation and use of instructional materials. Rural directors place a lower priority on actually developing materials locally, however.

Improving in-service education for teachers is an even higher priority item for rural directors than for others. Only rural program directors have improvement in local workshops as one of their highest priority items.

ESL Directors

Although fewer ESL directors place a HIGH priority on reaching the least literate and unemployed than is the case for basic education

directors, a larger proportion assign a HIGH priority to more effectively concentrating on the hardest to reach target groups. ESL directors, unlike basic education directors, place a HIGH priority on designing special programs to meet the needs of specific groups.

For obvious reasons, fewer ESL program directors are concerned with finding better ways of reaching Blacks than is the case for basic education directors. However, one in seven ESL directors sees Blacks as the TOP priority target group. While only half of ESL directors nationally regard Mexican Americans as a HIGH priority target group, for one-fourth of all ESL directors, Mexican Americans are the TOP priority target group. ESL directors place a higher priority on improved ways of identifying potential students than do basic education directors. The expressed need for improved instructional materials in ESL was among the highest General Priorities only for ESL directors. Highest priority in the area of Instructional Materials was the development of improved materials in ESL. ESL directors generally place more stress on materials than do basic education directors. In fact, not only is the percentage of these directors who want improved materials in ESL very high -- over 80% -- but more ESL directors than basic education directors place a HIGH priority on developing improved materials for beginning and intermediate reading.

ESL directors place a higher priority on improving small group instruction than do basic education directors. They also, along with urban basic education directors, place a HIGH priority on more effective use of the learning laboratory. ESL directors are less concerned with improved evaluation of the instructional program than are basic education directors.

CHAPTER III

PRIORITY CLUSTERS OF LOCAL DIRECTORS IN URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL PROGRAMS

To assist the designers of Special Projects, a correlation analysis was performed to identify clusters of HIGH priority items that might be incorporated in one or more projects. Clusters were identified for each of thirteen items that had been designated as HIGH (High or Highest) priority by 70% or more of all ABE directors responding to the ABE Priorities Survey. Cluster analysis was performed separately of directors' responses for three types of ABE programs: urban, rural, and ESL. (Urban basic education programs are those which have less than 50% ESL students and over 65% urban students. Rural basic education programs have under half ESL students, and over 65% of their students are rural. ESL programs are those in which half or more of the students are not native speakers of English.)

The thirteen HIGH priority items from the survey and their clusters of correlated items are presented in Appendix I-B, broken down according to the three types of programs -- urban, rural, and ESL. For each type of program, the cluster presented is composed of the top seven correlates.

Concentration on the Hardest to Reach
(See Table B-1, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

For directors of urban programs, the hardest to reach are the least literate, the unemployed and the non-English speaking. Finding more effective ways to recruit students from these particular groups is an important priority for directors who wish to concentrate on the hardest to reach. Urban programs are also looking for ways to serve the least literate more effectively and place a high priority on ways to enhance the effectiveness of beginning level classes and develop more effective materials in beginning reading. Thus, one correlate of finding more effective ways to concentrate on the hardest to reach is the provision of programs better designed to meet the needs of these special target groups.

Rural Basic Education Programs

More effective recruitment of the most illiterate is a key concern of rural directors who place a high priority on concentrating on the hardest to reach. The development of more effective approaches to interagency referral relations and the use of paraprofessionals as recruiters are specific program practices cited by rural directors who are attempting to concentrate on the hardest to reach.

Finding more effective ways to use methods appropriate for adults in ABE instruction is also highly correlated with more effective programs concentrating on the hardest to reach.

Specific groups which need to be served more effectively include the handicapped, the non-English speaking, and urban dwellers.

ESL Programs

Concentrating on the hardest to reach is correlated with better ways to recruit the least literate for directors of ESL programs. More effective ways to work through other agencies to recruit students are needed, as is the employment of full-time recruiters. Other items which are correlated with concentration on the hardest to reach are for ESL directors, projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of the provision of child care services for students and the use of volunteers in the ABE program.

Increase Community Support for the ABE Program
(See Table B-2, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

Finding more effective ways to increase community support for the ABE program is correlated with developing more effective and productive co-sponsorship relations. Other related priorities include finding better ways to obtain suitable instructional facilities and to demonstrate the advantages of providing transportation for students. Employment of paraprofessionals is also a high priority item for directors concerned with increasing community support for the ABE program.

Ways to more effectively educate prison inmates and to reach and educate Puerto Ricans are correlated with efforts to increase community support in the responses of urban directors whose programs could potentially serve these groups.

Rural Basic Education Programs

Ways to develop effective and productive co-sponsorship relations and to secure suitable instructional facilities are correlated with

increasing community support for the rural ABE programs.

For rural directors, community support is correlated with finding better ways to increase student motivation and to recruit and serve adults living in rural population centers. Another priority target groups for rural directors concerned with increasing community support is the handicapped.

Finding more effective ways of coaching new staff members by more experienced personnel also is correlated with increasing community support.

ESL Programs

Recruitment concerns are highly correlated with increasing community support for directors of programs with large ESL components. Finding or demonstrating more effective ways to use mass media is recruitment -- both electronic and printed -- is part of this cluster of concern. An expressed need for better approaches to developing productive co-sponsorship arrangements and more effective ways of working through other agencies to recruit students are also highly correlated priorities.

Finding more effective ways to coordinate ABE and GED programs is another need which is correlated with the ESL directors' expressed need to increase community support for the ABE program.

Recruitment of the Unemployed
(See Table B-3, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

More effective recruitment of the unemployed is correlated with a concern for finding ways to provide more effective educational experiences for this group.

Recruiting the unemployed and more effectively meeting their needs is the center of a cluster of concerns which include ways to more effectively recruit and serve welfare recipients, young males, Blacks, Asians (where applicable), as well as the most illiterate.

Rural Basic Education Programs

For rural ABE programs the need to find ways to more effectively recruit and educate the unemployed is paralleled by a similar concern for the least literate, welfare recipients, and young males.

Other needs which relate to the priority placed on recruiting the unemployed include ways to provide more effective instruction in "coping skills" and more effective use of ABE teachers to counsel students.

There is also a correlated priority placed on more effectively working through other agencies to recruit students.

ESL Programs

The need to recruit the unemployed is correlated with finding ways to more effectively reach and serve welfare recipients and Asians, as well as with developing ways to make more effective use of paraprofessionals as recruiters and to work through other agencies to recruit students.

Directors who are concerned with more effective recruitment of the unemployed also tend to see a need for improved instruction in "coping skills." Specifically, directors would like to find more effective ways of providing in-service education in coping skills and have available more effective instructional materials in this area.

Another related need is to find more effective means of placing students in jobs or training programs.

Provide In-Service Education for Teachers
(See Table B-4, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

The need for more effective provision of in-service education for teachers is linked with an expressed concern for ways to design and conduct more effective in-service programs for all ABE staff -- para-professionals, counselors, and supervisors. More effective programs for supervisors is a particularly highly correlated concern for urban programs.

More effective ways to determine staff needs for in-service education are required by directors who place a high priority on better in-service education programs. Another correlated need is to maximize the use of local workshops.

Urban basic education program directors who see a need for more effective in-service education for teachers are particularly concerned with providing them with more effective in-service programs regarding diagnosis of student learning needs. They place a high priority on finding more effective ways to prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs.

Rural Basic Education Programs

Among rural directors the need for better in-service programming for teachers is correlated with the need for finding better ways to conduct programs for other ABE staff. Local workshops are seen as a format with particular potential for improvement.

Rural directors concerned with the problem of more effective in-service education see a need for more effective planning of a comprehensive and coherent program and, in particular, for more effective ways to determine staff needs for in-service education.

Rural directors are particularly concerned with improving in-service education regarding adult learning and development.

ESL Programs

The same common concerns are shared by ESL program directors: the need for better in-service programming for teachers is correlated with better models of in-service education for paraprofessionals, supervisors and counselors, and there is a particular stress on improving local workshops.

Among ESL directors there is a related need for more effective ways of determining staff needs for in-service education. In addition, they would like to find better ways for involving staff members in setting overall program goals and priorities.

The content area of most concern to ESL directors who want improved in-service education for teachers is instructional methods.

In-Service Education: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs
(See Table B-5, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

Diagnosis of student learning needs and evaluation of student progress are closely related. Urban Basic Education directors see a need for improved methods to more effectively diagnose student learning needs, prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs, and evaluate student achievement. At the same time, more effective methods of in-service education are needed in these areas.

Urban directors who see improved in-service education concerning diagnosis of student learning needs as a high priority also emphasize the need for improved in-service education concerning adult learning and development and understanding the student population.

More effective ways to foster student participation in setting objectives and evaluating learning activities is another concern which is linked to this cluster of needs.

Rural Basic Education Programs

For rural basic education directors the need to demonstrate improved ways to diagnose student learning needs is linked with the need to find better ways to prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs and to evaluate student progress.

The need for improved in-service education programs concerning evaluation of student achievement is also closely related to in-service education regarding diagnosis of student learning needs. Other areas of in-service education which are related among the responses of rural directors are instructional methods and materials.

Rural directors who place a high priority on improving in-service education programming in these areas also give priority to improving the use of coaching less experienced staff as a method for providing in-service staff development.

ESL Programs

Improved in-service education concerning diagnosis of student learning needs is linked to the need to find more effective means of diagnosing student learning needs and prescribing learning activities to meet those needs. This priority need is also related to a concern for improvement in other staff development programming concerning adult learning and development and evaluation of student achievement. There is also a correlated need to make more effective use of work in the classroom of a more experienced teacher as a tool for in-service education. Other related priority concerns are finding more effective ways to increase student motivation and foster student participation in setting and evaluating learning objectives.

Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs
(See Table B-6, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

Improved prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs is closely related as a priority to improvement in methods of diagnosing student learning needs and evaluating student progress. Improved evaluation of the overall instructional program is also a related priority for urban basic education program directors.

Urban directors' stress on the demonstration of improved means

of diagnosing student learning needs is correlated with a perceived need for finding more effective ways of providing in-service education in instructional methods, instructional materials, and evaluation of student achievement.

Rural Basic Education Programs

The need for improved prescriptions of learning activities is linked with the need for improved diagnosis of student learning needs.

Among rural directors, diagnosis is also related to the need to more effectively use methods appropriate to adults and foster student participation in setting objectives and evaluating learning activities in the classroom.

Areas in which need for improvement in in-service education is correlated with the need for improved prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs are selection, adaptation and use of instructional materials and methods, diagnosis of individual learning needs, and evaluation of student achievement.

ESL Programs

The need for more effective ways to prescribe learning activities to meet the needs of individual students is highly correlated with the need to demonstrate more effective diagnostic procedures and to provide better in-service education for ABE staff in the area of diagnosis of student learning needs. Other areas in which improved in-service education is related to better prescriptions of learning activities are adult learning and development and evaluation of student achievement.

Also related is an emphasis on finding more effective ways to increase student motivation.

Other related needs include finding more effective ways to adapt published materials for local use and to develop materials locally.

Build Student Self-Confidence
(See Table B-7, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

The need to find more effective ways to build student self-confidence is linked to a need for better ways to increase student motivation.

Other components of the instructional process for which needed improvement is related to building student self-confidence include evaluation of student progress and prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs. Better use of methods appropriate to adults is also related to building student self-confidence, as is more effective adaptation of commercially available materials for local use.

Improvement in in-service education programming in the areas of understanding the student population and in the use of instructional materials are related priorities of urban directors.

Rural Basic Education Programs

The need to build student self-confidence is related to finding improved practices to increase student motivation and to retain students in the program.

Another set of priority needs included in this cluster concerns evaluation of student progress. There is a related need to demonstrate

more effective ways to evaluate student achievement and to provide in-service education with regard to this process.

The need to develop more effective ways to diagnose student learning needs is another related priority concern for rural basic education directors.

Provision of more effective in-service education for counselors is related to building student self-confidence. More effective instruction in "coping skills" also appears in this cluster of concerns around the problem of building student self-confidence.

ESL Programs

Building student self-confidence and increasing student motivation are related. Improved orientation of new students to the program and more effective diagnosis of student learning needs are correlated priority needs.

Among ESL directors the need for more effective instruction in "coping skills" is related to the need to build student self-confidence. More effective use of classroom teachers to counsel students is also a related priority.

Development of more effective materials in the areas of family life education and "coping skills" is also part of this cluster of priority needs.

Retain Students in Program
(See Table B-8, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

How to increase student motivation and build student confidence are linked to the concern about student retention rates among urban basic education directors. Improved use of ABE teachers to counsel students is also part of this cluster of concerns, as is more effective diagnosis of student learning needs.

The need for improved in-service education programs in the areas of instructional methods and of selecting, adapting, and using instructional materials are correlated with the need to retain students in the ABE program.

More effective ways to identify and locate instructional materials is another priority element in this cluster of concerns of urban basic education directors.

Rural Basic Education Directors

Finding ways to build student self-confidence is correlated with the need to improve retention among rural basic education directors. Ways to better evaluate student progress in the ABE program are also a high priority concern among rural directors concerned with retention.

More effective development and use of inter-agency referrals is also part of the cluster of concern centering on retention, as is improved use of ABE teachers to counsel students.

Rural basic education directors who place a high priority on improving student retention also tend to place a high priority on improving recruitment of the unemployed.

Improved evaluation of in-service education programs as well as more effective use of state and regional programs of in-service education are also components of the cluster of rural concern centering on retention.

ESL Programs

Improved diagnosis of student learning needs and more effective use of methods appropriate to adults are priority needs correlated with concern among directors of ESL programs for retention of students.

Priority placed on improving student retention also correlates with concern for improved recruitment of urban adults and working through other agencies to recruit students.

More effective use of local workshops in in-service education and improved provision of in-service education for paraprofessionals are other priorities which cluster around the central concern of improving student retention for directors of predominantly ESL programs.

Another priority which correlates with priority placed on student retention is the development of more effective materials in beginning reading.

Increase Student Motivation
(See Table B-9, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

The priority need to increase student motivation is related to the need to build student self-confidence. Finding more effective ways to foster student participation in setting objectives and evaluating learning activities is linked to increasing student motivation.

Improved diagnosis of student learning needs and improved prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs are also part of this cluster of concerns, as is improved evaluation of student progress.

More effective in-service education in the areas of understanding the student population and diagnosis of student learning needs are correlated concerns among urban basic education directors.

Rural Basic Education Programs

Building student self-confidence and fostering student participation in setting objectives and evaluating learning activities in the classroom are concerns which are related to the need to find better ways to increase student motivation among rural directors. Improved evaluation of student progress is also related to the problem of increasing student motivation.

Better orientation of new students to the ABE program and also improved ways to minimize disruption due to continuous enrollment of new students are components of this cluster of concerns

Other priority items which correlate with priority assigned to increasing student motivation are development of more effective materials in civics and provision of more effective in-service education in the use of instructional technology.

ESL Programs

Concern about increasing student motivation is highly correlated with priority placed on finding more effective ways to foster student participation in setting objectives and evaluating learning activities in the classroom.

Improved diagnosis of student learning needs and prescription of learning activities to meet those needs are also key related priorities.

More effective in-service education programs in the areas of diagnosis of student learning needs and evaluation of student achievement are also cited by ESL directors who place a high priority on increasing student motivation.

The demonstration of more effective ways to adapt materials for local use is also part of this cluster of concern.

Diagnose Student Learning Needs
(See Table B-10, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

The need for improved practices in diagnosing student learning needs and in prescribing learning activities also form part of this cluster of correlated priorities for improved program practices. Another related priority is demonstration of more effective ways to evaluate student progress.

Increasing student motivation is a priority concern for urban basic education directors who place a high priority on finding improved methods of diagnosing student learning needs.

Improved in-service education programs in several areas is part of this cluster of concern. These areas are diagnosis of student learning needs, instructional methods, and evaluation of student progress.

Rural Basic Education Programs

Rural directors who place a high priority on finding improved methods for diagnosing student learning needs also see improved prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs as an important area for improvement. Ways to effectively use methods appropriate to adults as well as better evaluation of student progress are components of this cluster of concern. Better approaches to orientation of new students is a correlated need.

Improved in-service education programming in the areas of diagnosis and evaluation are needed, as is more effective in-service education concerning selecting, adapting, and using instructional materials.

ESL Programs

The demonstration of more effective means of increasing student motivation is a high priority concern for ESL directors who need improved methods of diagnosing student learning needs. Better prescription of learning activities to meet these needs and more effective ways to encourage student participation in setting learning objectives and evaluating learning activities are related problems.

ESL directors would like more effective in-service programs concerning adult learning and development, diagnosis of student learning needs, and evaluation of student achievement.

Another correlated priority need is for improved ways to adapt materials for local use.

Use Methods Appropriate to Adults
(See Table B-11, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

More effective use of samll group instruction, and improvement in keying instruction to behavioral objectives are priorities for urban directors placing a high priority on more effective use of methods appropriate to adults. Finding better ways to improve student self-confidence is also part of this cluster of concern. More effective methods for evaluating the instructional program are sought by these urban directors.

Improved selection of competent classroom teachers, and more effective involvement of the staff in setting program goals and priorities also are included in this cluster. More effective use of ABE teachers to counsel students is similarly related to the use of methods appropriate to adults.

Rural Basic Education Programs

Rural basic education directors concerned with using methods appropriate to adults place a high priority on finding more effective ways to key the curriculum to behavioral objectives. Better means of evaluating instructional programs are also sought by these directors.

The need for better diagnosis of student learning needs and improved evaluation of student progress are also part of this cluster of concern centering on the use of methods appropriate to adults.

Rural basic education directors also relate this concern to the need to provide better in-service education for counselors and supervisors. Better means for identifying and locating instructional materials are need as well.

ESL Programs

Priority placed by ESL directors on more effective use of methods appropriate to adults is highly correlated with need to improve the use of curricula keyed to behavioral objectives. More effective evaluation of the instructional staff is another related concern. More effective recruitment of urban adults is a correlated priority for ESL directors.

Other priority needs in this cluster are in the area of instructional materials. They are better means of identifying and locating instructional materials, more effective ways to adapt existing materials for local use, and better local development of new materials. Another correlated need is for the development of more effective adult materials in civics.

In-Service Education in Instructional Methods
(See Table B-12, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

There is a cluster of correlated needs in the area of in-service education programming. A priority need for improved in-service education concerning selecting and using instructional methods correlates with the need for improved instructional technology, selecting, adapting and using instructional materials, and diagnosis of student learning needs. Improving ways of prescribing learning activities to meet individual needs is a related priority need. Better ways of utilizing programmed materials are also sought.

More effective evaluation of the instructional program is another

priority which correlates with the need for better in-service education concerning instructional methods.

Rural Basic Education Programs

The priority given by rural directors to improving in-service education in the area of instructional methods is related to a priority need for improving in-service programming in the areas of instructional materials, instructional technology and diagnosis of student learning needs.

More effective instructional practices need to be developed. This general priority area is one of the highest correlates for this item. Other specific needs for improving the instructional process that cluster here are prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs and use of methods appropriate to adults.

Another related priority need concerns better provision of dependable information on the quality and applicability of instructional materials.

ESL Programs

ESL directors who place a high priority on more effective in-service education in instructional methods also tend to place high priority on improved use of methods appropriate to adults and more involvement of students in setting program goals and priorities.

These directors are concerned with improving the general process of in-service education: finding out staff needs for in-service education and providing more effective in-service education for teachers. Other correlated areas in in-service education are instructional

materials and adult learning and development.

Improved evaluation of the instructional program also is part of this cluster of concerns centered around the need for improved in-service education in instructional methods.

Recruit Most Illiterate
(See Table B-13, Appendix I)

Urban Basic Education Programs

Priority on better recruitment of the most illiterate is correlated with finding more effective ways to reach and serve the least literate and improved recruitment of the unemployed. Also in this cluster is the need to demonstrate more effective ways of concentrating on the hardest to reach.

Emphasis on beginning level classes and the development of more effective materials in beginning reading are related priority concerns. More effective employment of paraprofessionals is another need which clusters around this priority.

Rural Basic Education Programs

Priority placed on better recruitment of the most illiterate is correlated with priority placed on finding more effective ways to reach and serve the least literate and improved recruitment of the unemployed. Also in this cluster is finding more effective ways of concentrating on the hardest to reach.

Finding more improved ways of building student self-confidence and involving students in setting program goals and priorities are related priority concerns for rural directors. More effective evaluation

of student progress is an important related concern. In the area of in-service education, improved programming concerning instructional methods is sought.

ESL Programs

ESL directors who place a high priority on recruiting the most illiterate also see a need to find more effective ways to reach and educate the least literate and improved means of concentrating on the hardest to reach. The demonstration of more effective ways to work through other agencies to recruit students is another related need.

All other priorities in this cluster relate to in-service education for teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, and supervisors.

CHAPTER IV

PRIORITIES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS

REGIONAL DIFFERENCES

There are many potential experimental and demonstration projects which are of greater priority in some regions of the country than in others. This is due in part to differences in the target populations which predominate in the various regions and in part to differences among ABE systems. Differences revealed by the ABE Priorities Survey have been analyzed for the multi-state regions officially designated by HEW. A chi square test was used to determine regional differences among directors.

In reporting regional differences, the following criteria were used. If 60% or more of the directors in a particular region assigned an item a HIGH priority and if the percentage of HIGH priority ratings by directors in that region is at least 10% greater than the percentage of HIGH priority ratings nationally, that item will be reported. If the reverse is ture, and the item received 60% or more HIGH priority ratings nationally but less than 50% in a particular area, the item will be reported for that region.

Region I (New England states)

English as a second language is of more importance in Region I than in the nation as a whole. Over three-fifths of Region I local directors responding to the Priorities Survey questionnaire see the development of materials in ESL as a HIGH priority area.

Another curriculum area in which Region I local directors feel the need for improved materials is family life education. Two-thirds of directors in Region I see this as a HIGH priority need to be met through a special experimental and demonstration project.

Region I program directors are particularly concerned with finding or demonstrating more effective ways to use ABE teachers to counsel students. Three-fifths of Region I respondents place a HIGH priority on this, while only one half of directors nationally do so.

Region I is largely urban in its program emphasis. Less than thirty percent of Region I directors place a high priority on more effectively reaching and serving rural adults. The proportion nationally is twice as high.

The provision of dependable information on the quality and applicability of instructional materials is less of a problem in Region I than elsewhere. Only half of directors in Region I, as opposed to two-thirds nationally, place a HIGH priority on projects in this area.

Table 9

REGION I
(in percent)

A. High Priority Items

	REGION I (N = 48)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Use ABE Teachers to Counsel Students	61.9	50.0
Develop Materials in Family Life Education	67.4	56.2
Develop Materials in ESL	61.9	42.9

B. Low Priority Items

More Effectively Reach and Educate Rural Adults	28.6	60.4
Recruit Rural Adults	45.5	61.7
Provide Dependable Information on Quality and Applicability of Instructional Materials	50.0	65.7

Region II (N.Y., N.J. only)

Region II program directors want to more effectively reach and educate Blacks and ESL students. Region II programs are characteristically urban rather than rural, and recruiting and educating rural adults more effectively is of low priority for Region II directors.

Over four-fifths of local directors in New York and New Jersey place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to reach and educate Blacks. Only half of directors nationally share this. Over two-thirds of respondents in Region II place a HIGH priority on recruiting non-English speaking participants more effectively. Similarly, large proportions of directors in Region II place a HIGH priority on

demonstrating more effective provision of ESL instruction and developing more effective materials in ESL.

Only one-fourth of directors in Region II, but three-fifths of directors nationally, place a HIGH priority on more effectively reaching and serving rural adults.

Less than half of directors in Region II see materials in consumer education as a HIGH priority need. Almost two-thirds of directors nationally place HIGH priority on projects in this area.

Table 10

REGION II
(in percent)

A. High Priority Items

	REGION II (N = 43)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Reach and Educate Blacks	81.4	49.9
Reach and Educate Non-English Speaking	66.7	38.5
Provide ESL Classes	60.5	38.2
Recruit Non-English Speaking	69.0	41.8
Recruit Blacks	72.1	47.6
Develop Materials in ESL	62.8	42.9

B. Low Priority Items

Reach and Educate Rural Adults	23.0	60.4
Recruit Rural Adults	26.3	61.7
Develop Materials in Consumer Education	48.8	64.4

Region III (Penn., Va., West Va., Del., Md.)

Almost nine out of ten directors in Region III place a HIGH priority on recruiting the most illiterate more effectively. This compares with seven out of ten nationally.

Three-fifths or more of Region III directors place HIGH priority on more effective utilization of professional ABE staff with other primary responsibilities in the recruitment effort.

Blacks are an important segment of the target population in Region III. More effective ways to reach and educate Blacks is a HIGH priority to a greater proportion of directors in Region III than in the nation as a whole.

Seven out of ten local directors in Region III place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to coordinate the ABE and GED programs.

Table 11

REGION III
(in percent)

High Priority Items

	REGION III (N = 72)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Reach and Educate Blacks	65.7	49.9
Coordinate ABE and GED Programs	71.4	57.4
Use Professional ABE Staff with other Primary Responsibilities in the Recruitment Effort	61.7	45.4
Recruit Most Illiterate	88.7	71.4
Recruit Blacks	62.7	47.6

Region IV (Ala., Fla., Ga., Ken., Tenn., Miss., N.C., S.C.)

Program directors in Region IV place a significantly higher priority on reaching and educating the most illiterate, Blacks, and rural adults than do program directors nationally.

Over two-thirds of directors in Region IV place a HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective ways to orient new students to programs. This is a HIGH priority item for just over half of directors nationally.

Another item which is of particular HIGH priority in Region IV is to find or demonstrate more effective ways to key the curriculum to behavioral objectives.

Table 12

REGION IV
(in percent)

High Priority Items

	REGION IV (N = 187)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Reach and Educate Blacks	89.4	49.9
Reach and Educate Rural Adults	75.0	60.4
Recruit Most Illiterate	84.6	71.4
Recruit Blacks	66.3	47.6
Recruit Rural Adults	76.2	61.7
Orient New Students to Program	69.5	53.5
Key Curriculum to Behavioral Objectives	67.1	51.3

Region V (Ill., Ind., Mich, Minn., Ohio, Wisc.)

This region is representative of the U.S. as a whole as far as priorities for developing more effective practices in ABE are concerned.

Reaching and educating the least literate is of slightly higher priority in Region V than it is nationally.

Table 13

REGION V
(in percent)

High Priority Item

	REGION V (N = 127)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Reach and Educate Least Literate	75.5	65.1

Region VI (Ark., Ia., N.M., Okl., Texas)

Two areas are of greater concern for directors in Region VI than they are nationally. These are: instructional materials and the relationship between the ABE and GED program.

Two-thirds of directors in Region VI place a HIGH priority on experimental and demonstration projects in the general area of instructional materials. An equal proportion of Region VI directors place a HIGH priority on finding or demonstrating more effective ways to identify and locate instructional materials.

More effective coordination of the ABE and GED program is of HIGH priority for two thirds of local directors in Region VI. Only 57% of directors nationally place a HIGH priority on this item.

Table 14

REGION VI
(in percent)

High Priority Items

	REGION VI (N = 114)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
General Priority: Instructional Materials	66.6	54.4
Coordinate ABE and GED Programs	67.7	57.4
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	67.7	56.8

Region VII (Iowa, Kan., Mo., Neb.)

A larger proportion of directors in Region VII than nationally place a HIGH priority on more effectively reaching and educating rural adults, and on recruiting rural adults.

They see a greater need for more effectively providing dependable information on the quality and applicability of available materials than do directors nationally. Region VII directors also place significantly higher priority on developing more effective materials in consumer education than do directors nationally. Three-fourths of directors in Region VII, but less than two thirds of directors nationally, place HIGH priority on materials development in this area.

Table 15

REGION VII
(in percent)

High Priority Items

	REGION VII (N = 52)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Reach and Educate Rural Adults	71.5	60.4
Recruit Rural Adults	72.3	61.7
Provide Dependable Information on Quality and Applicability of Available Materials	77.6	65.7
Develop Materials in Consumer Education	75.0	64.4

Region VIII (Col., Mont., N.D., S.D., V., Wy.)

Region VIII is similar to Region VII. Items which receive higher priority in Region VIII than they do nationally are: (1) reach and educate rural adults and (2) develop materials in consumer education.

Six out of seven Region VIII directors place a high priority on finding more effective ways to reach and educate rural adults. This compares with three out of five directors nationally.

More effective materials in consumer education are of HIGH priority to over three-fourths of directors in Region VIII. This is significantly higher than the national average of 64%.

Table 16

REGION VIII
(in percent)

High Priority Items

	REGION VIII (N = 60)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Reach and Educate Rural Adults	87.2	60.4
Develop Materials in Consumer Education	76.3	64.4

Region IX (Ariz., Calif., Nev.; continental U.S. only)

The priorities of Region IX directors center around their concern with reaching the non-English speaking, specifically Mexican-Americans.

While only one quarter of directors nationally place HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective ways to reach and educate Mexican-Americans, five out of every six directors in Region IX place a HIGH priority on improving program practice in this area.

Twice as many directors in Region IX than in the nation as a whole are concerned with recruiting and with educating non-English speaking adults.

Three out of five Region IX directors give HIGH priority to demonstrating the effectiveness of special programs designed specifically to meet the needs of a specific group. This is of HIGH priority to only two-fifths of directors nationally.

Seven out of ten Region IX directors place a HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective ways to provide ESL instruction and develop more effective materials in ESL.

The target population in Region IX is largely urban. Only two-fifths of directors in Region IX give a HIGH priority to more effective recruitment and education of rural adults, whereas three-fifths of all directors nationally place a HIGH priority on improvement of ABE program operation in this direction.

Two other groups are of significantly lower concern to directors in Region IX than elsewhere. These are: welfare recipients and young males.

Table 17

REGION IX
(in percent)

A. High Priority Items

	REGION IX (N = 49)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Reach and Educate Mexican-Americans	83.4	26.3
Recruit Mexican-Americans	75.5	26.3
Reach and Educate Non-English Speaking	79.2	38.5
Recruit Non-English Speaking	79.2	41.8
Provide ESL Classes	70.2	38.2
Provide Special Program for Special Groups	62.8	38.6
Develop Materials in ESL	77.1	42.9
B. Low Priority Items		
Reach and Educate Rural Adults	37.8	60.4
Recruit Rural Adults	42.6	61.7
Reach and Educate Welfare Recipients	46.8	59.8
Recruit Young Males	42.6	60.9

Region X (Wash., Id., Ore., excluding Alaska)

Target groups which are of particular concern to directors in Region X are: rural adults, most illiterate, and Indians. Whereas only 15% of directors nationally place a high priority on more effectively reaching Indians, over three-fifths of directors in Region X place a HIGH priority on this group. Four-fifths of Region X directors would like to reach rural adults more effectively, and almost

9 out of 10 place a HIGH priority on more effectively recruiting the least literate.

Sixty-three percent of Region X directors give HIGH priority status to projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of special programs designed to meet the needs of specific groups. Less than 40% of directors nationally are interested in this.

Two-thirds of directors in Region X gave HIGH priority to finding more effective ways of using ABE teachers to counsel students. Nationally, only one half od directors see this as a HIGH priority project.

Table 18

REGION X
(in percent)

	REGION X (N = 24)	NATIONAL (N = 776)
Planned In-Service Education Program	63.6	49.1
Special Programs for Special Groups	63.1	38.6
Recruit Indians	63.6	15.3
Recruit Rural Adults	79.2	61.7
Recruit Most Illiterate	88.2	71.4
Use ABE Teachers to Counsel Students	65.2	50.0

Chapter V

PRIORITIES OF ABE TEACHERS

General Priorities

Teachers were asked to indicate the "priority of need you feel for projects to find or demonstrate more effective program practice in each of these program areas...." Areas included were: recruitment, in-service education, instruction, instructional materials, use of paraprofessionals, counseling and learning labs.

Almost four-fifths of teachers placed a HIGH priority on projects in the area of instructional materials. One quarter of respondents said this was the single TOP priority area for special experimental and demonstration projects.

Three-quarters of the teachers placed a HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective program practice in the area of instruction. One-fifth see this as the area of greatest need. Almost two-thirds of teachers see recruitment as a HIGH priority area for improved practice and almost three-tenths say this is the TOP priority area.

Table 19

GENERAL PRIORITIES
ABE TEACHERS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY* (N=430)	TOP PRIORITY* (N=356)
Instructional Materials	78.6	25.6
Instruction	74.7	19.1
Recruitment	65.0	28.4

* Criterion for reporting: only those items designated as HIGH by 60% or more and as TOP by 12.5% or more. (Where no item receives the minimum percentage for TOP, the item receiving the most designations is reported.)

Instruction

There were two parts to the Instruction section of the ABE priorities Survey questionnaire sent to ABE teachers. The first concerned the process of instruction; the second, with teaching in specific skills areas such as intermediate reading or consumer education. The four highest priority items in the first part concerned the instructional process; teachers' ratings paralled those of directors.

More effective ways to prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs are a HIGH priority for four-fifths of ABE teachers and the TOP priority for more teachers than any other item in the Instruction section. Diagnosis of student learning needs is an area in which three-fourths of ABE teachers place HIGH priority on improved practice. Three-fifths of ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on projects leading to improved evaluation of student progress. Teachers' priority for improvement in this area is significantly lower than that of directors.

Over four-fifths of ABE teachers indicate that they give a HIGH priority to finding more effective ways to build student self-confidence. Their concern in this area is significantly higher than that of local directors. ABE teachers, however, are less concerned than are directors with the problem of increasing student motivation, which is a HIGH priority for approximately three-fourths of ABE teachers. This indicates a different perception on the part of the teachers and directors of the relative importance of self-confidence and motivation as they affect student persistence and performance.

The second part of the Instruction section required the teachers to assign priorities for demonstration projects to find more effective instructional practices in various content areas of ABE. The highest priority content area was speaking and listening skills (70% HIGH). This was due in part to the high priority placed on speaking and listening skills by ESL teachers. The second-ranked content area was intermediate reading with 66% HIGH priority ratings; improved instruction in beginning reading received HIGH priority from just over 60% of ABE teachers.

More effective instruction in "coping" skills is a HIGH priority for 62% of teachers. Teachers see more need for improvement in this area than do the directors. More effective instruction in computational skills and writing skills are a HIGH priority for just over 60% of ABE teachers.

Teachers were asked to indicate the priority they would place on demonstrating more effective ways to use various instructional methods or techniques such as small group instruction and programmed materials. Only one - use of individual tutoring - is a HIGH priority to as many as three-fifths of ABE teachers.

Table 20

INSTRUCTION
ABE TEACHERS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=420)	TOP PRIORITY (N=339)
Build Student Self-Confidence	82.9	-
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	80.2	11.8
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	74.7	-
Increase Student Motivation	73.6	-
More Effective Instruction in Speaking and Listening Skills	70.5	-
More Instruction in Intermediate Reading	65.5	-
More Effective Instruction in "Coping" Skills	62.0	-
More Effective Instruction in Computational Skills	61.7	-
More Effective Instruction in Beginning Reading	61.5	-
More Effective Instruction in Writing Skills	61.2	-
More Effective Use of Individual Tutoring	60.9	-
Evaluate Student Progress	60.1	-

In-Service Education

There were three parts to the section on In-Service Education in the ABE Priorities Survey questionnaire sent to teachers. They dealt with: the process of planning and implementing in-service education programs; alternative formats or forums for in-service education programs; and specific content areas of in-service education programs.

Almost three-quarters of ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on finding improved ways to find out needs of potential participants in in-service programs and three-fifths indicate that special projects in improved evaluation of in-service programs are of HIGH priority.

Under three-fifths of ABE teachers placed HIGH priority on more effective implementation of in-service education in any particular format. They are not concerned with improving practice in this regard. They do, however, place a HIGH priority on better in-service education in many areas.

ABE teachers feel a greater need for improved in-service education concerning methods of instruction and instructional materials than do ABE directors. Four-fifths of ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on improved in-service programs concerning selecting, adapting and using instructional materials. Three-quarters consider improved programs in instructional methods to be a HIGH priority need. Even more - 80% - are specifically concerned about improved programs dealing with the problem of selecting methods appropriate for individual students. This is closely linked with the problem

of diagnosing student learning needs. Over three-fourths of ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on improved in-service education in this area, and almost as many teachers similarly rank programs concerning selecting objectives appropriate for individual students.

Four-fifths of ABE teachers indicate that improved programs concerning building student self-confidence are of HIGH priority. This and the findings cited above confirm and reinforce priorities which exist in the area of instruction. Adult learning and development is an area in which over two-thirds of ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on improved in-service education; local directors share this concern.

Over three-fifths of ABE teachers would like to see improved in-service programs concerning student recruitment (66% HIGH) and retention (64% HIGH).

Three ABE subject matter areas are of particular concern to teachers, who place a HIGH priority on improved in-service education programs to increase their competency in these areas. The subjects with which teachers are concerned are: beginning and intermediate reading and "coping" skills.

Table 21

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
ABE TEACHERS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=410)	TOP PRIORITY (N=327)
Improved Programs concerning Instructional Materials	80.5	-
Improved Programs concerning Selecting Methods appropriate for Individual Students	80.1	-
Improved Programs concerning Building Student Self-Confidence	79.2	-
Improved Programs concerning Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	77.1	-
Improved Programs concerning Methods of Instruction	75.1	-
Improved ways to find out Needs of Potential Participants in In-Service Programs	73.9	-
Improved Programs concerning Selecting Objectives Appropriate for Individual Students	73.1	-
Improved Programs concerning Adult Learning and Development	68.3	-
Improved Programs concerning Student Recruitment	66.3	-
Improved Programs concerning How to Teach Intermediate Reading	64.2	-
Improved Programs concerning Evaluation of Student Achievement	63.7	-
Improved Programs concerning Student Retention	63.7	-
Improved Programs concerning How to Teach Beginning Reading	63.4	-
Improved In-Service Education for Teachers	63.2	-
Improved Program concerning the Use of Instructional Technology	61.8	-
Improved Programs concerning How to Teach "Coping" Skills	61.1	-

Counseling

Counseling is not a high priority area of concern for ABE teachers. Only one item in this section of the ABE Priorities Survey was of HIGH priority for as many as three-fifths of teachers. Two others were nominated as the single TOP item by a significant number of teachers.

Over two-thirds of ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to follow up on dropouts. Almost one fourth of respondents singled this out as the TOP priority item in the area of counseling.

Finding more effective ways to place students in jobs or training programs is of HIGH priority for over half of ABE teachers, as is demonstrating better ways to orient new students to the program.

Table 22

COUNSELING
ABE TEACHERS

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=401)	TOP PRIORITY (N=320)
Follow Up on Dropouts	68.6	23.8
Place Students in Jobs or Training Programs	56.2	12.8
Orient New Students to Program	51.7	12.8

Instructional Materials

There were three types of items in the Instructional Materials section of the ABE Priorities Survey of ABE teachers. The first dealt with the utilization of instructional materials, the second with developing materials in specific subject matter areas, and the third with developing materials for specific target populations.

Over seventy percent of ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on improving the provision of dependable information on the quality and applicability of instructional materials. This is the same degree of concern expressed by local directors.

Two-thirds or more teachers also indicate that better ways of identifying and locating available materials, as well as of adapting them for local use, are HIGH priority needs. Teachers' concern in these areas is greater than that of local directors.

Content areas which teachers see as of HIGH Priority for developing materials include all levels of reading and intermediate mathematics. Teachers are less concerned than are directors with such areas as health and consumer education.

Target groups for which teachers would most like to see improved materials are the unemployed, least literate, welfare recipients, and rural adults. These are the same target groups that directors see as of HIGH priority for improved educational effectiveness. Over two-thirds of all ABE teachers place a HIGH priority on developing more effective materials for use by the unemployed. Somewhat fewer place HIGH priority on improved materials for use by the least literate, welfare recipients, and rural adults.

Table 23

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
ABE TEACHERS

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=415)	TOP PRIORITY (N=318)
Provide Dependable Information on Quality and Applicability of Instructional Materials	71.8	-
More Effective Materials for Use by Unemployed	68.4	-
Improved Ways to Adapt Materials for Local Use	68.2	-
Improved Ways to Identify and Locate Instructional Methods	66.5	-
Improved Materials in Intermediate Reading	65.6	-
Improved Materials for the Least Literate	64.6	-
Improved Materials in Beginning Reading	64.8	-
Improved Materials in Advanced Reading	62.7	-
Improved Materials in Intermediate Mathematics	61.8	-
Improved Materials for Welfare Recipients	61.2	-
Improved Ways to Develop New Materials Locally for Local Use	60.9	-
Improved Materials for Rural Adults	60.5	-

Paraprofessionals

Teachers responded to the section of the ABE Priorities Survey concerning paraprofessionals only if there were paraprofessionals on the staff of their ABE program. Approximately 260 teachers responded to this section.

About two-thirds of the respondents placed a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to use paraprofessionals in materials development. This item received the largest proportion of HIGH priority ratings in this section.

More effective use of paraprofessionals in tutorial instruction is also a HIGH priority item for teachers. Somewhat under two-thirds of the respondents rated this a HIGH priority item and 22% indicated this as the TOP priority need concerning paraprofessionals.

Sixty percent of respondents place a HIGH priority on more effective use of paraprofessionals in student recruitment and over one-quarter of ABE teachers single out student recruitment as the TOP priority for special projects concerned with paraprofessionals.

Group instruction is another HIGH priority area for better utilization of paraprofessional staff. Just over three-fourths of the teachers responding gave this a HIGH priority rating.

Table 24

PARAPROFESSIONALS
ABE TEACHERS

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=260)	TOP PRIORITY (N=189)
More Effective Use of Paraprofessionals in:		
Materials Development	65.4	-
Tutorial Instruction	64.9	22.2
Group Instruction	60.9	-
Student Recruitment	60.0	27.5

Learning Labs

Teachers were directed to complete this section of the questionnaire only if students in their ABE program receive all or part of their instruction in a learning lab. Approximately 190 teachers out of 446 responded to this section.

Better coordination of students' group and learning laboratory learning activities is a HIGH priority item for teachers. Where the emphasis is on individualized instruction in the learning lab, there are still many occasions when group instruction is needed. Coordinating class and individual work is of HIGH priority for just under two-thirds of respondents.

A similar proportion of teachers place HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective ways to prescribe the appropriate learning program. This parallels the concern with diagnosis and prescription in ABE instruction as a whole. A related concern, which is also of HIGH priority for over three-fifths of respondents, is the need to more effectively insure continuity and proper sequence in student learning activities in the lab.

The learning lab may be the focus of the ABE instructional program or it may play a more subordinate role. Sixty-three percent of teachers responding place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to use the learning lab to provide instructional variety.

Two items in this section were each singled out as the TOP item by one in seven respondents. They are both concerned not with specific uses of the learning lab, but with its overall operation and utilization. Just over three-fifths of the teachers place a

HIGH priority on finding better means to evaluate the instructional effectiveness of the learning lab. Just under three-fifths rate demonstrating more effective ways to keep the materials inventory complete and up-to-date a HIGH priority concern.

Table 25

LEARNING LABS
ABE TEACHERS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=190)	TOP PRIORITY (N=128)
Coordinate Work in Lab and Classroom where Emphasis is on Lab	65.7	-
Prescribe Appropriate Learning Program	65.1	-
Ensure Continuity and Proper Sequence in Student Learning Activities	64.5	-
Use the Learning Lab to provide Instructional variety	63.6	-
Evaluate the Instructional Effectiveness of Lab	63.3	14.8
Keep Materials Inventory Complete and Up-to-date	57.0	14.8

Chapter VI

PRIORITY CLUSTERS OF TEACHERS IN BASIC EDUCATION AND ESL PROGRAMS

Two groups of respondents were identified: teachers who teach only basic education classes, and teachers who teach only English as a second language. For each group of teachers, a correlation matrix of priority ratings for each item on the questionnaire was developed.

Clusters of correlated items were identified for the highest priority items -- nine items on the questionnaire of HIGH priority (combining High and Highest ratings) for three-quarters or more of all teachers responding to the ABE Priorities Survey. The top seven correlates of each of the nine HIGH priority concerns are presented below for basic education and for ESL teachers.

Build Student Self-Confidence

(See Table C-1, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

Many teachers seem to identify the need for demonstrating improved practices with the need to improve in-service education. So it is not surprising to find in this case that the need to develop improved ways to build student self-confidence is highly correlated with a desire for better in-service education programming addressed

to improving student self-confidence. There is also a related priority rating given to finding more effective ways of increasing student motivation.

For basic education teachers building student self-confidence is also related to improved instruction in a number of specific areas: civic skills, health education, and "coping" skills. There is a need to develop more effective methods of instruction in these areas, and also to improve both materials and in-service education which will enable teachers to teach more effectively.

ESL Teachers

ESL teachers' expressed need for improved practices in the area of building student self-confidence appears to be linked to the need for improved in-service education in this area. Other aspects of the instructional process whose improvement is related to building student self-confidence are: diagnosis of student learning needs and fostering student socialization in the classroom.

A related emphasis among ESL teachers is providing more effective vocational counseling for students and finding better ways to place students in jobs or training programs.

Priority placed on the development of improved materials in beginning and intermediate arithmetic also correlates with the priority assigned to finding more effective ways of building student self-confidence among ESL teachers.

Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs

(See Table C-2, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

A cluster of priorities in the area of finding or demonstrating more effective program practices in the area of instruction centers around the need to find better ways to prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs. Better diagnosis of student learning needs, and improved use of curricula keyed to behavioral objectives are two correlates. Other correlates are more effective ways to foster student participation in setting learning objectives and also in evaluating learning activities.

Finding better methods for evaluating student progress in the ABE program is another priority in this cluster of needs. Evaluation of the overall instructional program is also a correlated priority.

ESL Teachers

The general priority concern for special projects in the area of instruction clusters here. Better diagnosis of student learning needs and also more student participation in setting learning objectives are related concerns.

Two other correlates in the area of more effective in-service education are selecting methods and selecting objectives appropriate for individual students.

Another priority in this cluster of concerns is to more effectively identify and locate instructional materials. Also related is the need for better evaluation of the overall instructional program.

Diagnose Student Learning Needs

(See Table C-3, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

Improved prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs and better ways of evaluating student progress are part of this cluster of priorities.

Better in-service education for counselors and more effective in-service education programs in the areas of diagnosis of student learning needs and improving teacher-student relations are also related priorities.

Demonstrating better ways to teach intermediate reading is another priority need in this cluster. Evaluation of the overall instructional program is also included.

ESL Teachers

The need for improved methods of diagnosing student learning needs is related to the need for better prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs. Also, in-service education in the area of diagnosis of student learning needs is a related priority.

ESL teachers who place a high priority on improvement in this area of the instructional process also place a high priority on improved approaches to building student self-confidence. There is also a correlated priority placed on better use of small groups engaged in problem solving in the instructional process.

Better strategies for evaluating the overall instructional process are sought.

A particular area of need in this cluster is computational skills. ESL teachers see a need for better in-service education concerning instruction in this area. Another related need is for the development of materials in intermediate reading.

In-service Education re: Instructional Materials

(See Table C-4, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

Related areas in which improved in-service education are needed are: methods of instruction, instructional technology, and teaching beginning reading.

High priority is also placed on developing more effective instructional materials, on finding better ways to identify and locate instructional materials, and on providing dependable information about the quality and applicability of instructional materials.

Better evaluation of the in-service education program is another related priority item.

ESL Teachers

Related areas in which improved in-service education programming is needed include: (1) ABE program objectives and current operations, (2) methods of instruction, (3) use of instructional technology, and (4) student retention.

More effective ways to develop new materials locally are part of this cluster of concern. Materials in the area of health education are also of priority importance.

In-service Education re: Selecting Methods Appropriate for Individual Students

(See Table C-5, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

Related areas of needed improvement in in-service education programming are: (1) building student self-confidence, (2) diagnosis of student learning needs, (3) selecting objectives appropriate to individual students, and (4) teaching intermediate reading.

This cluster of concerns also takes in the general priority of improving the instructional process.

There is also a related priority placed on both developing materials for the least literate and finding more effective ways to adapt materials for local use.

ESL Teachers

Two related priorities concern the planning of the in-service

education program. These priorities for improved practice are: (1) find out the needs of potential participants in the in-service program and (2) plan the content of the in-service program.

Specific areas in which in-service education programming needs to be improved are: (1) building student self-confidence, (2) diagnosing student learning needs, and (3) selecting objectives appropriate for individual students.

Better means of identifying and locating instructional materials and adapting them for local use need to be developed.

In-service Education re: Building Student Self-Confidence

(See Table C-6, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

More insight into how to build student self-confidence is needed. Teachers concerned about in-service education in this area would also like to see improved in-service programs in the areas of (1) improving teacher-student relations, (2) counseling students in academic or personal matters, and (3) selecting methods appropriate for individual students.

Better ways of providing personal counseling for students need to be devised. Basic education teachers also see a related need to use small groups engaging in problem solving more effectively in the instructional process.

ESL Teachers

Better means of finding out the needs of potential participants in in-service education programs need to be developed.

Specific areas in which improved in-service programs are needed include: (1) diagnosis of student learning needs, (2) selecting methods appropriate for individual students, and (3) counseling students in academic or personal matters.

Other priorities in this cluster for ESL teachers concern the development of more effective instructional materials. Better materials are needed in the areas of advanced reading (gr. levels 7-8), beginning arithmetic (1-3), and intermediate arithmetic (4-6).

In-service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs

(See Table C-7, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

Not only is improved in-service education programming needed, but also more effective means of diagnosing student learning needs must be developed.

Related areas in which improved in-service programs are needed include: (1) evaluation of student achievement, (2) student program prescription, and (3) selecting methods appropriate for individual students. Improved needs-determination processes must be developed to identify the requirements of potential participants in in-service

programs.

Additional items in this priority cluster concern improved utilization of paraprofessionals in counseling students and materials preparation.

ESL Teachers

More attention should be paid to effectively finding out the needs of potential participants in in-service education programs.

Better programs are needed to increase teachers' capabilities in the area of evaluation of student achievement as well as diagnosis of student learning needs. Also, teachers want to be better prepared to set objectives and select methods appropriate for individual students.

Better in-service education for teachers and more effective instructional materials are required for teaching beginning and intermediate level reading.

In-service Education re: Methods of Instruction

(See Table C-8, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

This priority is part of several priorities for more effective program practice in the area of instruction and better in-service education programming for teachers.

Specific areas in which need for improved in-service education

is indicated include methods of instruction, selecting and adapting instructional materials, as well as such broader concerns of teachers of adults as: philosophy of adult education, adult learning and development, and understanding the student population.

Better ways to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional process, especially in learning laboratories, are needed.

ESL Teachers

This priority correlates with a priority placed on developing more effective instructional practices across the board and also with providing more effective in-service education for teachers.

Particular areas in which improved staff development is needed include, in addition to methods of instruction, (1) adult learning and development, (2) instructional materials, (3) use of instructional technology, and (4) student program prescription.

For ESL teachers indicating these priorities, other correlated high priority items are the use of paraprofessionals in materials development and use of the learning lab to provide instructional variety.

General Priority: Instructional Materials

(See Table C-9, Appendix I)

Basic Education Teachers

Basic education teachers who place a high priority on more

effective use and development of materials also see a need for improving in-service education programs and demonstrating more effective instructional practices. They tend to place a high priority on finding more effective ways to evaluate the instructional program and use programmed materials.

Improved staff development programs in the area of selecting, adapting, and using instructional materials is another related priority. More effective ways of identifying and locating instructional materials are also needed.

ESL Teachers

ESL teachers who place a high priority on more effective practice in developing and using instructional materials tend to also see a great need for finding more effective ways of increasing student motivation. Other priorities in this cluster concern more effective staff development. Particular areas in which more effective in-service programs are needed are: (1) ABE program objectives and operations; (2) selecting, adapting and using instructional materials; (3) student program prescription; and (4) evaluation of student achievement. More effective use of college and university courses for staff development is favored.

Chapter VII

PRIORITIES OF STATE DIRECTORS

State directors assigned priority ratings to the same set of items as did local directors. Their priority ratings were consistently higher than were those of local directors. That is, although items ranked were substantially the same, these items received a greater proportion of HIGH priority ratings from state than from local directors. For this reason, in selecting items of highest priority for discussion of state directors' responses, a cut-off point of two-thirds HIGH priority ratings has been used rather than the three-fifths criterion used in presenting HIGH items for local directors.

General Priorities

The greatest concern of state directors is with recruitment. In this they concur with local directors, although only one-third of state directors, as opposed to over half of local directors, see this as the single most important area for experimental and demonstration projects.

Four-fifths of state directors place a HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective ways of providing in-service education. This concern is not shared by local directors. State directors are more concerned than are local directors with selecting competent instructors and evaluating the performance of instructional staff. For state directors, improvement in the

quality of the ABE teaching personnel is a primary means of increasing the overall effectiveness of the Title III effort.

Instruction is the third general area of program operation of HIGH priority for over two-thirds of state directors. The three areas of recruitment, in-service education, and instruction have the most direct impact on final program outcomes. They determine the inputs -- who the students are, the skills of teachers, and the process of ABE classroom instruction -- which together determine program output.

Table 26

GENERAL PRIORITIES
STATE DIRECTORS

(in percent)

	HIGH* PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP* PRIORITY (N=24)
Recruitment	82.0	33.3
In-Service Education	80.0	-
Instruction	71.4	-

*Criterion for reporting: 67% or more, HIGH; 20% or more, TOP.

Target Groups

State directors are most concerned with more effectively teaching and educating the least literate. Over 90% of state directors place a HIGH priority on more effectively recruiting and educating this group and over one-third single out the least literate as the TOP priority group. This degree of concern is significantly higher than that of local directors.

Welfare recipients and the unemployed are a second group of potential ABE participants who, in the view of state directors, are not now being recruited as successfully, nor educated as effectively, as they should be. Four-fifths of state directors place a HIGH priority on special experimental and demonstration projects designed to find better ways of reaching and serving these groups.

Young males and Blacks are singled out as HIGH priority target groups by two-thirds of state directors. In states where Blacks make up a significant proportion of the potential target population, reaching them more effectively is always a special concern. Young males are often notably absent from ABE classrooms, although they are a prime target for the educational services of ABE. State directors would like to see more young males in ABE classrooms. They are also especially concerned with the rural adult target group.

Table 27

TARGET GROUPS
STATE DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP PRIORITY (N=26)
Least Literate	94.2	34.6
Welfare Recipients	82.4	-
Unemployed	82.3	-
Rural Adults	79.4	-
Urban Adults	71.9	-
Young Males	68.7	-
Blacks	66.7	-

Selected Practices

All state directors place a HIGH priority on concentrating on the hardest to reach target groups. Over 40% of state directors see this as the single TOP selected practice. Special projects are needed to demonstrate modifications in normal ABE practice required if potential ABE participants who are hardest to reach are to profit from the existence of Title III. This concern confirms and supports the priority which state directors place on more effectively teaching and educating the least literate, unemployed, welfare recipients, and young males.

Instruction in "coping" skills and emphasis on beginning level

classes are two other practices which are HIGH priority for experimental and demonstration projects for large numbers of state directors. The former is directly related to effectively educating the hardest to reach.* Beginning level classes must be effective if the least literate are to be served.

The HIGH priority placed on a planned in-service education program by state directors follows from their concern with this area of program practice as revealed in their responses to the first section of the ABE Priorities Survey.

Table 28

SELECTED PRACTICES
STATE DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP PRIORITY (N=26)
Concentration on Hardest to Reach Target Groups	100.0	42.3
Planned In-Service Education programs	67.7	-
Instruction in "Coping" Skills	67.7	-
Emphasis on Beginning Level Classes	67.6	-

*Darkenwald, Gordon G. "Some Effects of the 'Obvious Variable': Teacher's Race and Holding Power with Black Adult Students." Pre-publication manuscript, Center for Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Program Management

Over nine-tenths of state directors place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to evaluate overall program effectiveness. They are more concerned with the problem of evaluating program effectiveness than are local directors.

A similar proportion of state directors place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to gain support for the ABE program. This support can be of two types, and each is seen as important by 90% of state directors. State directors need to find ways to obtain additional resources to supplement existing funds. They also want to increase community support for the ABE program. These needs are complementary. Increased community support may be sought through improving the effectiveness and visibility of the ABE program.

Just over three-fourths of state directors place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways of involving students and staff in setting ABE program goals and priorities. State directors want program participants and staff to have a larger voice in setting the objectives of local program efforts.

The selection of competent classroom teachers and evaluation of instructional staff are related areas of concern. State directors place a HIGH priority on improving program practice in these areas. Over 70% place a HIGH priority on finding or demonstrating more effective ways to select and evaluate ABE teachers. This is significantly higher level of concern than that expressed by local directors. Less than half of local directors place a HIGH priority on special projects in these areas.

Table 29

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
STATE DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP PRIORITY (N=24)
Evaluate Overall Program Effectiveness	91.4	20.8
Obtain Additional Resources to Supplement Existing Funds	91.2	-
Increase Community Support for the ABE Program	90.7	29.2
Involve Staff in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	76.6	-
Involve Students in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	76.4	-
Select Competent Classroom Teachers	72.7	-
Evaluate Instructional Staff	71.9	-

Recruitment

State directors' responses to this section of the questionnaire confirm their concern with more effectively reaching the hardest to reach. Ninety-seven percent of state directors place a HIGH priority on more effective recruitment of the least literate and over 40% singled this out as the single most important (TOP) need in the area of recruitment. Other groups which make up the hardest to reach are also of HIGH priority for state directors. They are the unemployed and young males.

Rural and urban adults are priority groups for more effective recruitment for equal numbers of state directors. Three-fourths of state directors are concerned that more effective ways of recruiting rural adults be demonstrated; an equal proportion place HIGH priority on better recruitment of urban adults.

State directors, like local directors, place a HIGH priority on finding or demonstrating more effective ways to work through other agencies to recruit students. The hardest to reach will not come into ABE on their own initiative. They are hard to find. But they are often in contact with other public agencies and could perhaps be reached through these agencies.

Two-thirds of state directors place a HIGH priority on more effectively evaluating the student recruitment effort. This ties in with their concern with evaluating overall program effectiveness. Evaluating current efforts is important for improving future practices.

Table 30

RECRUITMENT
STATE DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP PRIORITY (N=21)
Recruit:		
Most Illiterate	97.2	42.9
Unemployed	85.3	-
Rural Adults	76.5	-
Urban Adults	76.5	-
Young Males	75.8	-
Work through Other Agencies to Recruit Students	73.5	-
Evaluate the Student Recruitment Effort	67.6	-

In-Service Education

State directors place a HIGH priority on improving in-service education for ABE teachers. The area of greatest concern concerns the teachers' ability to diagnose student learning needs and evaluate student achievement. Almost 95% of state directors place a HIGH priority on finding or demonstrating more effective ways to provide in-service education concerning the diagnosis of student learning needs. For over one-fourth of state directors, this is the TOP need in the area of in-service education. State directors see this as a higher priority area of need than do local directors. Better

in-service programs concerning evaluation of student achievement are a HIGH priority for just under nine-tenths of directors.

Eighty-five percent of state directors assign a HIGH priority to improving in-service education in two areas directly affecting teacher performance in the classroom. These areas are instructional methods and instructional materials. In-service education programs concerning methods and materials would deal with selecting, adapting, and using effective methods and materials. Instructional methods as well as instructional materials must be appropriate to learning needs, learning styles, and learning objectives of the learner.

About three-fourths of state directors see as a HIGH priority improvement in two related areas: understanding the student population and adult learning and development.

Nine-tenths of state directors place a HIGH priority on providing more effective in-service education for teachers. Three-fourths assign a HIGH priority to improved in-service education for supervisors and counselors. State directors place a higher priority on improving in-service education for counselors and supervisors than do local directors (sig=.06). For two-thirds of state directors, demonstrating more effective ways to provide in-service education for paraprofessionals is a HIGH priority.

Almost three-fourths of state directors place a HIGH priority on demonstrating more effective ways to use local workshops in the in-service education program. Two-thirds see participation in curriculum

development as a valuable potential forum for in-service education and place a HIGH priority on exploring this potential. Other formats for in-service education -- coaching, university courses, state or regional workshops -- were not nominated by state directors.

Two-thirds of state directors assign a HIGH priority to improving basic processes involved in designing and implementing an effective staff development program: needs assessment, motivation, and evaluation. These processes would have to be carried out successfully if any of the priority demonstrations suggested above were to be undertaken.

Table 31

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
STATE DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP PRIORITY (N=22)
In-Service Programs re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	94.3	27.3
Provide In-Service Education for Teachers	91.4	-
In-Service Programs re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	88.5	-
In-Service Programs re: Instructional Methods	85.3	-
In-Service Programs re: Instructional Materials	84.8	-
In-Service Programs re: Understanding the Student Population	76.5	-
In-Service Programs re: Adult Learning and Development	75.7	-
Use Local Workshops in In-Service Education	73.5	-
Provide In-Service Education for Supervisors	73.5	-
Provide In-Service Education for Counselors	73.5	-
Provide In-Service Education for Paraprofessionals	67.7	-
Use Participation in Curriculum Development for In-Service Education	67.7	-
Find out Staff Needs for In-Service Education	66.7	-
Motivate Staff Participation in In-Service Education	66.6	-
Evaluate In-Service Education Programs	66.6	-

Instruction

Retaining students who enroll in the ABE program is clearly the most important priority of state directors in the area of instruction. Almost all directors give it HIGH priority, and one fifth -- the largest concentration -- single retention out as the TOP priority item. Other very high priority items in this section give a picture of steps that state directors would take to increase retention.

State directors place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to evaluate the instructional program. Their emphasis on improvement in this area is significantly higher than that of local ABE directors.

Two specific related components of the instructional process are singled out by state directors as of very high priority for improved practice. These are diagnosis of student learning needs and prescription of learning activities to meet individual needs. Almost 95% of state directors assign a HIGH priority to projects to demonstrate more effective methods of diagnosis and prescription. This confirms the high priority which state directors give to improving in-service education programs in these areas.

In addition to the emphasis on improving the degree to which the instructional program meets the needs of individual students, state directors are also concerned with increasing active student participation in the ABE program. Over nine-tenths of state directors place a HIGH priority on projects to demonstrate more

effective ways of fostering student participation in setting objectives and evaluating learning activities. This is a significantly larger percentage than among local directors. A similar proportion of state directors give HIGH priority to projects to find ways to increase student motivation. A related concern, building student self-confidence, is a HIGH priority for four-fifths of state directors.

State directors place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to evaluate student progress. This is a HIGH priority item for four-fifths of directors. It is clearly related to the need for more effective ways of evaluating the instructional program as a whole. It also will require many of the same skills involved in diagnosing student learning needs.

Three-quarters of state directors give HIGH priority to more effective use of methods appropriate to adults. A similar proportion of directors would like to find better ways to key the curriculum to behavioral objectives.

Table 32

INSTRUCTION
STATE DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP PRIORITY (N=24)
Retain Students in Program	97.0	20.8
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	94.2	-
Evaluate Instructional Program	94.2	-
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	94.1	-
Increase Student Motivation	92.3	-
Foster Student Participation in Setting Objectives and Evaluating Learning Activities	91.1	-
Evaluate Student Progress	79.5	-
Build Student Self-Confidence	79.4	-
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	75.7	-
Key Curriculum to Behavioral Objectives	72.8	-
Place Students in Jobs or Training Programs	70.6	-
Use ABE Teachers to Counsel Students	70.6	-
Use Small Group Instruction	70.6	-

Materials Development

The priorities of state directors in the area of materials development appear to be directly related to their desire to attract the hardest to reach into the program and provide an effective educational experience to meet their needs.

State directors place a HIGH priority on developing materials in beginning and intermediate reading (grade levels 1-3 and 4-6). Almost half of state directors single out beginning reading as the TOP priority need for materials development. Over 80% assign HIGH priority to materials at levels 1-3, over 70% to materials at levels 4-6.

Four other areas are of HIGH priority for materials development for between two-thirds and three-fourths of state directors: consumer education, family life education, health education, and "coping" skills. State directors see a need to go beyond the traditional "3 R's" if ABE is to effectively reach and serve the hard-core illiterate. To do so, effective instructional materials must be developed concerning the day-to-day tasks faced by the adult participant.

More than 60% of state directors place a HIGH priority on finding or demonstrating more effective ways to provide dependable information on the quality and applicability of instructional materials. One-fourth of state directors single this out as the TOP priority need in the area of instructional materials.

Table 33

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
STATE DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=37)	TOP PRIORITY (N=24)
Develop materials in:		
Beginning Reading	82.3	45.8
Intermediate Reading	73.5	-
Consumer Education	72.5	-
Family Life Education	70.6	-
Health Education	67.7	-
"Coping" Skills	66.7	-
Provide Dependable Information on Quality and Applicability of Instructional Materials	61.8	25.0

CHAPTER VIII

PRIORITIES OF REGIONAL STAFF

Regional staff surveyed were the Regional Program Officers and Regional Staff Development Directors from each of the ten HEW Regions which cover the United States and its territories. The priorities of staff on the regional level differ consistently from those of local and state personnel and reflect a broader view of the program.

General Priorities

The two highest priority areas for improvement in the eyes of regional program staff are in-service education and program management. Program management, which is a HIGH priority area for improvement for six out of seven regional staff members, is of equal importance for only one out of three local directors. Recruitment, the single highest priority area for over half of local directors, is of HIGH priority for only 50% of regional staff. (Data appear at end of chapter.)

Target Groups

While rural adults are of concern to two-thirds of local directors, only one-third of regional staff rate them of HIGH priority for improved service. On the other hand, while six of seven regional staff members place a HIGH priority on improved service to urban adults, only three out of seven local directors do so.

In stressing improved service to the unemployed and least literate, regional staff agree with local and state directors.

Selected Practices

Concentration on the hardest to reach target groups is the

highest priority concern for regional staff as well as for local and state directors.

Improved instruction in "coping" skills is of HIGH priority for a larger proportion of regional staff than of local directors.

Demonstrating effective employment of full-time staff and paraprofessionals is of HIGH priority for four out of five regional staff members. Only one-third of local directors see this as important.

Program Management

Regional staff emphasize the need to more effectively select competent teachers and paraprofessionals, and evaluate their performance to a much greater extent that do local program directors. Over seventy percent of regional staff place a HIGH priority on improved practice in these areas, twice the proportion of local directors.

While only half of local directors place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways to either disseminate information on innovative program practices or develop management systems enabling program adminstrators to make decisions based on feedback from program operation, three-quarters of regional staff members see this as a HIGH priority area.

The development of counseling services and involvement of students in setting program goals are other areas where regional staff see a higher priority need for improvement that do local program directors. While about half of local directors see these as HIGH priority areas, three out of four regional officials place HIGH priority on projects in these areas.

Recruitment

Regional staff members do not place as much emphasis on improving particular methods of recruitment, e.g., improved use of inter-agency referrals, as do local directors.

The two groups which need to be more effectively recruited, in the eyes of eight out of ten regional staff members, are the most illiterate and urban adults. Regional staff members do not place particularly strong emphasis on more effectively recruiting the unemployed and young males as do local directors.

In-Service Education

Regional staff members place greater emphasis on the need to improve the process of in-service education than do local directors. Just under 60% of local directors place a high priority on improved procedures for determining staff needs for in-service education and evaluating in-service education programs. These areas are of HIGH priority to 85 and 93 percent of regional staff, respectively.

Eight of ten local directors place a HIGH priority on providing improved in-service programs for teachers, but only half see a HIGH priority need for improving programs for paraprofessionals, counselors, or supervisors. Three-quarters or more of regional staff feel that improving in-service education for these other three groups is of HIGH priority.

Regional staff members place a higher priority on improved in-service education programs in the areas of understanding the student population and teaching "coping" skills than do local directors. While barely over half of local directors see these as areas of HIGH

priority need, three-quarters of regional staff do so.

Two areas in which local directors see a greater need for improvement than do regional staff are in in-service programming regarding the use of instructional methods and materials.

Instruction

Differences in the priorities of regional and local staff in the areas of instruction reiterate earlier differences. Regional staff place a higher priority on finding more effective ways to teach "coping" skills and utilize paraprofessionals than do local directors. Whereas almost three-quarters of regional staff see these as HIGH priority concerns, only one-half and one-third, respectively, of local directors concur.

Areas in which local directors place higher priority on improvement than do regional staff are increasing student motivation and use of behavioral objectives.

Instructional Materials

Regional staff do not assign a HIGH priority to improving the availability of dependable information with regard to the quality and applicability of instructional materials as local directors do. Similarly, they do not emphasize the need to more effectively adapt available materials for local use.

While 85% of regional staff say that improved materials are needed in the are of beginning reading (levels 1-3), only half see a similar HIGH priority need at the intermediate (4-6) level. This contrasts sharply with the priorities of local directors, two-thirds of whom place a HIGH priority on developing reading materials at

each level. Similarly, three-quarters of regional staff see a need for better materials in beginning arithmetic, while only three-fifths of local directors agree. Local directors see about the same need for improved materials in arithmetic at each level, while regional staff see greatest need at the lowest level, least at the advanced level.

While equal proportions of regional and local staff see a need for improved materials in consumer education, regional staff are more likely to place a HIGH priority on developing better materials in coping skills as well.

Table 34

HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
REGIONAL STAFF
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=15)
General Priorities	
In-Service Education	83.3
Instruction	76.9
Program Management	85.7
Target Groups	
Urban Adults	85.7
Unemployed	69.2
Least Literate	84.6
Selected Practices	
Instruction in "Coping" Skills	71.4
Concentrate on Hardest to Reach	85.7
Employ Full-time Staff	78.6
Employ Paraprofessionals	78.6
Program Management	
Select Competent Classroom Teachers	78.6
Select Competent Paraprofessionals	78.6
Evaluate Instructional Staff	71.4
Provide Feedback & Make decisions	78.6
Disseminate Information on Innovative Program Practices	71.4
Obtain Supplementary Resources and Funds	78.6
Increase Community Support for ABE	78.6
Develop Counseling Services	71.4

Evaluate Overall Program effectiveness	78.6
Involve Students in Setting ABE Goals	71.4
Involve Staff in Setting ABE Goals	78.6

Recruitment

Recruit Most Illiterate	85.7
Recruit Urban Adults	78.6

In-Service Education

Find out Staff Needs for In-Service education	84.6
Evaluate In-Service Education Program	92.9
Use Local Workshops	85.7
Use State and Regional Education Programs	85.7
Provide In-Service Education for:	
Teachers	100.0
Paraprofessionals	85.7
Counselors	71.4
Supervisors	71.4
In-Service Programs re:	
Adult Learning and Development	85.7
Understanding the Student Population	71.4
Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	93.3
Evaluation of Student Achievement	85.7
Teaching "Coping" Skills	71.4

Instruction

Diagnose Student Learning Needs	92.3
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	76.9
Build Student Self-Confidence	71.4
Teach Coping Skills	71.4
Evaluate Student Progress	78.6

Retain Students in Program	78.6
Evaluate Instructional Program	78.6
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	78.6
Use Paraprofessionals in Instruction	71.4

Instructional Materials

Develop Materials in Beginning Reading	85.7
Develop Materials in Beginning Arithmetic	76.9
Develop Materials in "Coping" Skills	71.4
Develop Materials for ESL	71.4

* Criteron for reporting: only those items designated as HIGH priority by 67% or more of respondents.

CHAPTER IX

PRIORITIES OF SPECIAL PROJECT DIRECTORS AND OF PROFESSORS OF ADULT EDUCATION

Ninety-three 309(b) Special Experimental or Demonstration Project directors from the grant years 1970, 1971 and 1972 were sent the ABE Priorities Survey. Forty-three project directors responded.

In presenting the highlights of their priority nominations, only questionnaire items which received HIGH priority ratings from three-fourths or more of respondents will be noted. This is due to the fact that the project directors' overall priority ratings were higher than those of other groups. To present, for instance, all items receiving HIGH ratings from 60% or more of the respondents would obscure important issues.

In general, items which stood out as of particularly HIGH priority for local directors are also among the highest priority items in the view of special project directors.

The second part of this chapter reports on the priority nominations of professors of adult education.

Special Project Directors

General Priorities

Instruction is the highest priority area for projects to find and demonstrate more effective practices, report the project directors. Recruitment is also a key area for improvement though not the most important one (as indicated by local directors).

Instructional materials is the other general area of HIGH priority for three-fourths or more of special project directors. Only slightly over half of local directors rate this area of HIGH priority.

Target Group

Like all other groups of respondents, project directors give highest priority to more effectively teaching the least literate and unemployed.

Their perceptions diverge from those of local directors surveyed in their emphasis on reaching urban adults more effectively. For local directors, rural adults were a more important target group.

Selected Practices

Special project directors place a HIGH priority on finding more effective ways for local programs to concentrate on the hardest to reach. This judgment is shared by other respondents.

Another selected practice of HIGH priority for project directors is instruction in "coping" skills. Special projects to improve instruction in "coping" skills are a HIGH priority only for somewhat more than half of local directors responding.

Special project directors are less interested in the possibilities of integrating or coordinating ABE and GED classes than are local directors.

Program Management

In this area, special project directors have priorities similar to those of local directors. Four items are the same for the two groups: (1) increase community support for ABE, (2) obtain supplementary resources and funds, (3) involve staff in setting ABE program goals, and (4) evaluate overall program effectiveness.

Recruitment

Special project directors, like local directors, see improved means of working through other agencies to recruit students as the one recruitment mechanism of outstanding priority for improved practices.

Target groups which special project directors think are of highest priority for improved recruitment efforts are urban adults and the most illiterate. We have already noted above the contrasting urban-rural emphasis of special project officers and local program directors. Just under three-quarters of special project directors place HIGH priority on improved recruitment of the unemployed.

In-Service Education

Aspects of in-service education activities which are rated by local directors as HIGH priority areas for special projects are similarly rated HIGH by special project directors. These concerns include staff development programming in the areas of diagnosis and evaluation of student learning needs and gains as well as the use of instructional methods and materials.

While they join local directors in singling out in-service education for teachers as a priority target for attempts to improve practice, special project directors also place HIGH priority on providing improved staff development programs for paraprofessionals and counselors.

Instruction

The eight items concerning instruction which are of highest

priority for local directors are among the ten items which over three-quarters of responding special project directors rated HIGH priority. Special project directors place a relatively higher priority on improving evaluation of the instructional program than do local directors.

The two items which special project directors single out more frequently for a HIGH priority rating than do local directors are teaching "coping"skills and keying the curriculum to behavioral objectives.

Instructional Materials

Only one item in this section is a HIGH priority concern for a special demonstration project for over three-quarters of 309(b) directors. This is the development of improved materials in beginning reading. Unlike local program directors, they do not see an equal need for improved reading materials at the intermediate level. Neither do they single out the need for information concerning available materials or for better ways to adopt materials for local use to the extent that local directors do.

Table 35

HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
309(b) PROJECT DIRECTORS
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=39)
General Priorities	
Recruitment	78.0
Instruction	84.6
Instructional Materials	76.9
Target Groups	
Urban Adults	81.1
Unemployed	78.3
Least Literate	83.3
Selected Practices	
Instruction in "Coping" Skills	82.9
Concentrate on Hardest to Reach	82.5
Program Management	
Obtain Supplementary Resources and Funds	82.1
Increase Community Support for ABE	76.9
Evaluate Overall Program Effectiveness	77.5
Involve Staff in Setting ABE Goals	82.0

Recruitment	(N=39)
Work through Other Agencies to Recruit Students	76.3
Recruit Most Illiterate	75.6
Recruit Urban Adults	86.4

In-Service Education	
Determine Staff Needs for In-Service Education	76.9
Provide In-Service Education for Teachers	90.0
Provide In-Service Education for Paraprofessionals	82.9
Provide In-Service Education for Counselors	75.0
In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	75.0
In-Service Education re: Instructional Methods	84.6
In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	82.0
In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	94.8
In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	86.9

Instruction	
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	97.5
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	97.5
Increase Student Motivation	89.7
Build Student Self-Confidence	86.8
Teach "Coping" Skills	76.3
Evaluate Student Progress	76.9
Retain Students in Program	87.1
Evaluate Instructional Program	82.1
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	89.5

Key curriculum to Behavioral Objectives	76.3
Instructional Materials	
Develop Materials in Beginning Reading	79.5

* Criterion for reporting: only those items designated as HIGH priority by 75% or more of respondents.

Professors of Adult Education

Forty-five professors of adult education, all of whom have been active in some role concerning basic education programs, responded to the ABE Priorities Survey. As a group, they have a distinct perspective on the operation of the ABE program. While many of their priority ratings are similar to those of other groups, particularly in the areas of in-service education and instruction, other ratings diverge from those of other groups. Only the highest priority items of adult education professors—those given HIGH priority by three-fourths or more of professors responding—will be discussed here.

General Priorities

The area of HIGH priority concern to the largest number of professors responding is in-service education. Nine out of ten professors see this as a HIGH priority focus for special projects. This contrasts with the perception of local directors, less than half of whom rate in-service education of HIGH priority.

The other general area which over three-quarters of professors rate of HIGH priority for demonstration projects is instruction, which

is also of HIGH priority for other groups of respondents. Unlike local directors, professors do not single out improved recruitment as a HIGH priority need.

Target Groups

Two target groups are rated as HIGH priority for improved service by over three-fourths of professors — Blacks and the unemployed. Although two-thirds of professors see improved service to the least literate as a HIGH priority concern for special projects, they place relatively less emphasis on this group. Their emphasis on better service to Blacks is unusually high.

Selected Practices

Almost nine out of ten professors see a planned in-service program as a HIGH priority focus for 309(b) projects. This contrasts sharply with the perception of local directors, only one half of whom rate this a HIGH priority concern.

Professors place relatively low emphasis both on concentrating on the hardest to reach and on coordinating ABE with GED programs.

Program Management

Improved evaluation of overall program effectiveness is of HIGH priority for almost all professors (95.1%) who responded. This concern was also one of the highest in this area of program management for local directors, two-thirds of whom rate this of HIGH priority for a special project. Three related items are of

HIGH priority for professors who responded: (1) selection of competent classroom teachers, (2) selection of competent paraprofessionals, and (3) evaluation of the instructional staff. While four-fifths of professors see these as important concerns for a 309(b) project to focus on, only two-fifths of local directors concur in this judgment. Improved dissemination of information concerning innovative practices is of HIGH priority for 80% of professors; only half of local directors would rate this a HIGH priority Special Project.

Finding more effective ways to increase community support for ABE and obtain supplementary resources and funds are of HIGH priority in the judgment of professors as they are for local directors.

Both local directors and professors place a HIGH priority on more effectively involving program staff in setting ABE goals. In addition, four-fifths of the professors place a HIGH priority on more effective involvement of students in the goal-setting process. Far fewer local directors rate this student involvement as important.

Recruitment

Four-fifths of professors responding to the survey see a HIGH priority need to improve ways to assess which groups in the community need ABE, as a basis for the recruitment program. Only three-fifths of local directors would count this a HIGH priority item.

More effective recruitment of the most illiterate and the unemployed is of high priority for professors as it is for local directors.

As in the previous section concerning target groups, professors single out Blacks as a key group for which improved recruiting strategies need to be evolved.

In-Service Education

While professors are in complete agreement with local directors in terms of the content areas for which in-service education programming should be improved, they see other high priority needs not stressed by local directors.

Professors are concerned with the process of in-service education. Over four-fifths of respondents placed a high priority on special projects focusing on each of these process factors: (1) determination of staff needs for in-service education, (2) motivation of staff participation, and (3) evaluation of in-service education programs. These are priority concerns for only one-half to three-fifths of local directors.

While many local directors place a high priority on finding more effective ways to use local workshops in in-service education, professors see a need for more effective use of staff participation in curriculum development.

Over four-fifths of professors see a HIGH priority need for improved in-service education for all members of the ABE program staff: teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, and supervisors. While a similar proportion of local directors rate improved in-service education for teachers a HIGH priority need to be met by demonstration projects, only half of local directors have a similar concern for

paraprofessionals, counselors, or supervisors.

Instruction

The nine highest priority concerns in the area of instruction are the same for professors and local directors and include: retention of students, student self-confidence and motivation, diagnosis and prescription of learning activities, evaluation, and the use of methods appropriate to adults. However, the relative importance placed on various items by each group differs.

Evaluation of student progress, which is of HIGH priority to the greatest proportion of professors, is the least important of the nine key items for local directors. Improved evaluation of the instructional program is also relatively more important in the view of professors. Student retention, one of the highest priority concerns of the local directors, is the least important of the nine key items among the professors who responded.

A tenth aspect of the instructional process was of HIGH priority to three-quarters of professors responding: improved utilization of small groups in instruction. Only 56% of local directors rated this a HIGH priority focus for a demonstration project.

Instructional Materials

Over three-fourths of professors responding to the survey rated improved strategies for adapting commercially prepared materials for local use a HIGH priority concern for a special project. Local

directors also see this as relatively important. Professors did not place as much emphasis on providing more dependable information concerning available materials as did local directors.

Four-fifths of professors see a high priority need for improved materials in consumer education. They do not place similar emphasis on materials in reading on arithmetic at any level. Local directors, however, rate improved materials in beginning and intermediate reading as relatively more important.

Table 36

HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
PROFESSORS OF ADULT EDUCATION
(in percent)

	HIGH PRIORITY (N=42)
General Priorities	
In-Service Education	90.7
Instruction	80.5
Target Groups	
Blacks	78.6
Unemployed	76.2
Selected Practices	
Planned In-Service Education Program	87.8
Program Management	
Select Competent Classroom Teachers	85.0

Program Management (cont.)	
Select Competent Paraprofessionals	76.6
Evaluate Instructional Staff	80.5
Disseminate Information on Innovative Practices	80.5
Obtain Supplementary Resources and Funds	75.6
Increase Community Support for ABE	82.9
Evaluate Overall Program Effectiveness	95.1
Involve Students in Setting ABE Goals	80.5
Involve Staff in setting ABE Goals	75.6

Recruitment	
Determine What Groups Need ABE	82.9
Recruit Most Illiterate	75.0
Recruit Unemployed	81.6
Recruit Blacks	75.0

In-Service Education	
Determine Staff Needs for In-service Education	88.4
Motivate Staff Participation in in-service education	84.1
Evaluate In-Service Education Program	88.4
Use Participation in Curriculum Development as part of In-Service Education Program	78.5
Provide In-Service Education for Teachers	95.8
Provide In-Service Education for Paraprofessionals	88.4
Provide In-Service Education for Counselors	81.0
Provide In-Service Education for Supervisors	85.7
In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	86.4
In-Service Education re: Understanding the Student Population	86.4

In-Service Education (cont.)

In-Service Education re: Instructional Methods	88.6
In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	79.5
In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	95.5
In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	84.1

Instruction

Diagnose Student Learning Needs	90.1
Prescribe Learning Activities to meet Individual Needs	90.4
Foster Student Participation in Planning and Evaluation	88.3
Increase Student Motivation	81.9
Build Student Self-Confidence	84.1
Evaluate Student Progress	93.0
Retain Students in Program	76.7
Evaluate Instructional Program	90.7
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	85.0
Use Small Group Instruction	76.7

Instructional Materials

Adapt Materials for Local Use	79.1
Develop Materials in Consumer Education	83.4

* Criterion for reporting: only those items designated as HIGH priority by 75% or more of respondents.

CHAPTER X

PRIORITIES OF THE CONSULTANT WORKSHOP

The consultant workshop conducted on June 8, 1973 at Columbia University brought together a broadly representative group of twenty leaders involved in adult basic education with senior adult education staff of USOE and the Center for Adult Education to address two tasks. One was to identify specific Special Project ideas pertaining to three themes of special interest to USOE: (1) Community Problems and ABE Program Responses, (2) Adult Career Education: Linkages with Business and Industry, and (3) Integration of ABE into the Work Situation. The second task was to identify Special Project priorities related to national program planning, policy formulation, theory development, and research requirements. This was in recognition of the broader responsibility of USOE for leadership in professional development of the field of adult education and to supplement the highly specific, program-oriented action priorities suggested by the several groups of practitioners surveyed by the Center.

Workshop participants were organized into three work groups, each devoting a morning session to identifying Special Project ideas pertaining to one of the three themes identified above and an afternoon session to the second task of formulating priorities for national program and professional development. Results of these deliberations are summarized below.

Community Problems and ABE Program Responses

Three components of the basic problem were identified. First, the need for doing a better job of identifying available community resources and making better use of them to serve ABE participants. Second, ABE and related programs designed to serve the least educated need to be made more accessible to those who need them. The service they provide must be made relevant to the needs of participants and program staff must improve its ability to reach, teach, and retain those who might participate. Third, there must be increased attention paid to the problem of building the self-confidence of participants to participate both in the community problem-solving process and in ABE programs. A number of models were suggested for 309(b).

1. Provide the local director with a simplified system of identifying existing local resources pertaining to specific community problems and of fostering their collaboration where appropriate.

2. Develop culturally relevant instructional materials and methods which capitalize upon major common concerns of specific groups of students among participants in the local project.

3. Demonstrate and assess new delivery systems to foster access of students to existing ABE programs.

4. Develop ways to incorporate into ABE curricula provision for building learner self-confidence and consciousness raising or increasing levels of awareness (a la Freire) of conditions which structure his situation.

5. Explore programmatic implications of the concept of basic community education: (a) bring together power structure leaders and broadly representative community education councils to set community development goals and commitments; (b) create an education-center through which the community education councils can identify, develop and use the local power structure and communications and influence networks.

Academic and other credentials could be pursued through community study and action within the context of the center; (c) demonstrate the potentialities of an adult development center in which individuals may be assisted to formulate educational plans within the context of a reexamination of life priorities, commitments, and directions. The center would maintain an up-to-date local data bank on adult education programs of all types. Life development counselors would help adults fit appropriate educational experiences into a sequence relevant to their long- as well as short-range priorities; (d) experiment with allowing recipient groups to run educational programs for their peers, calling upon help as necessary; (e) use mediated instruction, along lines pioneered by Eugene Johnson's Metropole programs, dealing with current community issues by networks of learning groups, perhaps in connection with cable TV or public service television; (f) create a center for information, referral, placement and training of paraprofessionals which links all relevant local agencies and organizations by which recipients and administrators of a program may undertake a continuing process of needs assessment; (h) use graduate students to assist in the development of a continuing system of community needs assessment.

6. Demonstrate how effective staff development, materials development, public information, and program analysis and evaluation can be incorporated into the full range of community education programs: drug education, environmental education, consumer education, education on aging, human relations education, correctional education, etc. How may coordination be effected by providing common services in support of these programs?

7. Mobilize task forces of leading adult educators to study all the various federal programs which have -- or should have -- significant adult education components and involve key agency personnel in planning and goal setting for their adult education programs, thereby fostering coordination.

8. Demonstrate ways of introducing adult education planning into the planning of new communities.

9. Develop a plan for organizational renewal of community agencies and institutions (e.g., a union, prison, or school system), by which those served by the agency are paid consultants or interns. Demonstrate new ways of facilitating communications with the agency and between agency personnel and local community people.

10. Demonstrate ways of using 309(b) funds as seed money to generate community resources devoted to solving local problems with emphasis on generating funding from other sources.

Adult Career Education: Linkages with Business and Industry

There is need for systematically studying and disseminating information about comprehensive ABE career education programs already in existence to provide models for other programs. There appears to be a lack of awareness and interest among leaders of industry concerning the potential benefit of cooperative basic education/career education programs. Industry requires assistance to acquire greater understanding of advantages in such collaboration; educators need to listen to employers and unions to be able to gear programs to their needs. Joint sponsorship of programs is an important condition of success and implies the added advantage of a sharing of accountability for program results.

Three key questions for ABE are: What kind of capacity exists in the ABE program to produce learner change in terms of capacity to move occupationally? What are the crucial educational problems involved? How do we prepare the learner to take advantage of employment opportunities?

Adjustments needed in both the educational system and the employment system before a good linkage system between the two can be developed require systematic examination. Educational change can't

be developed in a vacuum. Do we have the resources at the present moment to develop adequate linkages?

To the extent that industry gets behind education, education will get off its feet. One mission should be to educate leaders in industry to the problem of lack of job opportunity. We need to demonstrate how they can benefit from changes and what positive action they can take to alleviate the problem.

There is a need to examine the dollars invested by industry and business, and link ABE and GED money with the industries' educational funds. In the process of linking, industry would be educated to the benefits that it receives from having better educated employees, taught by trained ABE professionals. ABE funds could be a fulcrum to direct money spent on education by unions and industry to best benefit the student and consequently the industry.

Can adult education be active in bringing about societal change rather than waiting for it and then working on resources to use when it occurs? Can we be more innovative in showing business now that they can benefit from employing "our people?" Perhpas one way is to have a 309 policy which provides that for a local program to receive funds, it must spend a specified percentage on linking up with job programs.

We should look at successful existing linkage programs, analyze their components, put together the successful parts of existing models, and disseminate this information actively, giving industry incentives to adapt them. An initial mechanism for investigation would be use of a team, an investigative reporter and experienced AE person to dig

out real situations and key aspects of successful programs. One example of a program to look at is Project Build, a cooperative effort between the AFL-CIO, Manpower, ABE, and the building trades.

A possible dissemination and duplication device for successful program linkage models is the video-taping of a program such as the Chesapeake-Potomac Telephone Co. Adult Learning Center and showing it to business and industry. Having the executives in such a company discussing the benefits to that business of an educational link would give other companies the inducement to try it out.

The recommended approach for USOE involves three stages: careful analysis of successful existing programs; implementation of demonstration projects based on models derived from study of existing programs; and vigorous dissemination, not only of results of demonstration efforts but also of analysis of current programs.

Out of these questions and ideas, the working group recommended the following possible demonstration projects:

1. Study and comparatively analyze successful linkage projects, not just in ABE or industry, but in other fields, such as health as well. Identify, describe, and analyze successful program components, and disseminate successful practices of these projects.

2. Out of the above case studies, put together the successful practices into a variety of linkage models to form totally integrated systems, and create trial demonstration projects based on these models. Emphasis on the dissemination of results, and a commitment from the government to provide for duplication of successes in local ABE programs would be essential.

3. Study adult education programs in private industry. Find out what is going on, what kind of education, the amount of money used, how it is being used and under what philosophical assumptions. Identify the possible points where ABE and adult educators in general could influence the spending of money to enhance education in industry.

4. Identify the educational problems of the learner in various situations and find out what is needed to better prepare him for the occupational role, e.g., coping skills. Develop ways of teaching staff and teachers how to adapt and use instructional methods and materials for different target groups in different settings.

5. The final project in this strategy is one which would develop ways of publicizing what is good. Vigorously disseminate to people who can make a difference, e.g., Congress, industrial leaders. Educate leaders about the problems of job opportunities, what can be done about it, how beneficial cooperative efforts can be for everyone involved. Industry needs to publicize its successes also.

In addition to these project ideas, the work group felt that if a linkage with industry on a large scale is to work, a national advisory committee should be created. This should be a broad-based committee composed of educators, businessmen, students, and other leaders. Such a committee could give constant supervision and advice, and in addition, would enhance the resource capacity of the projects.

Integration of ABE into the Work Situation

This question is complicated by a number of structural constraints beyond the control of educators. Unemployment itself is a complex social and economic phenomenon requiring a much broader attack than education alone. Educational programs do enhance employment prospects for many individual workers. The problem of alienation and boredom endemic to assembly lines is a growing problem, but one that is only partially amenable to solution by education. Many educational programs have similar problems themselves. Solutions probably will involve restructuring the decision-making process in industry and involving workers in a decentralized decision-making structure.

There is the related problem of incentives and rewards. Educators can take a more active role in helping identify educative aspects in the work environment. Strengthening these could contribute to increased employee productivity and morale. However, external structural incentives would probably be required to make wide scale progress, such as tax incentives. Similarly, USOE can fund demonstration projects, but other incentives will probably be required to foster replication by industry after termination of that Office's support.

It was recommended that at-work ABE programs be encouraged by USOE according to the following four phases:

1. A comprehensive conceptualization of the problem should be systematically developed.

2. A field research study of at-work ABE programs already in progress. The study would investigate: What incentives are there for operating at work programs? What factors contribute to program success? What kinds of industries are likely to establish work programs? In addition, the study should investigate cost effectiveness and the philosophical basis underlying the establishment of at-work programs. The study should also formulate criteria for identifying industries where particular approaches to at-work programs would be most appropriate. The study should run for at least two years and be funded at between $100,000 and $200,000.

3. Phase three would be a controlled demonstration effort. A sample of 10 to 12 industries and unions, stratified on key dimensions, would be identified. Categories mentioned were: labor intensives vs. capital intensive; large vs. small; service vs. production orientation. Some industries and/or unions from each category would undertake an at-work ABE program while others would not. The at-work program might involve redefinition of jobs and employee responsibilities as well as the provision of instruction. Industries or unions not sponsoring an at-work program would serve as a control group. Results would then be evaluated. Such a project would entail considerable funding and time as it would have to run long enough for results to be apparent -- perhaps two years.

4. Phase four would involve replication. Several on-going pilot projects would be established to serve as models for other replicants. This phase might last three years or so. Labor unions would be viable sponsors. Eventually, federal support of the pilots would be phased out and they would be self-supporting. Stability would be an important criteria of the projects studied in phase two and of the projects selected for pilots in phase four.

The need for a fundamental conceptualization of the problem is reflected in the absence of any real professional consensus of what constitutes an educative work environment. The approach suggested could probably transcend the traditional locating of ABE classes within business and industry. Projects might be formulated which would involve the significant reorganization of decision-making structure within a department or a plant following examples from Sweden and Yugoslavia. Workers may become responsible for quality and quantity control in production, the schedule of work, and even the system of renumeration. Some employers in the United States, such as Bristol Meyers, have tried one or more of these variations in decision-making. Worker participation in decision-making generates the need for more education.

National Priorities for Planning, Policy, Theory and Research

Group I

The priorities identified in Group I reflected two basic areas of concern. One was the need for programs which more fully meet the needs of participants. The other was the need for improving the performance of the Title III program, and the 309(b) system.

Meeting the needs of participants:

(1) Research is needed to determine variations in individual learning styles and how the instructional system can flexibly serve individuals with diverse learning styles.

(2) Learning environments suited to meeting diverse learning needs and objectives of learners, and accessible to diverse groups must be developed. Accessibility requires communication and diversity. Programs should cut across learning environments.

(3) Specifically, modular, diversified education might be offered in the context of the public schools. Perhaps USOE could test out the feasibility of having full-time teachers, teaching youth half-time and adults the other half time, perhaps in the area of career education.

(4) Individual education may often prove pointless unless put in the context of community education and community development. Consciousness raising -- changing perceptual frames of reference -- may be a key element here.

(5) A counselor-based program, perhaps operating out of a community adult development center could help people re-assess long-term goals and personal directions and select appropriate learning experiences for both short and long-range goals; maintain an up-to-date inventory of such educational resources.

Improving program performance

(1) Improved evaluation procedures. What is the impact of ABE on the individual learner? Teachers and paraprofessionals may be the best evaluators, since they are in close contact with the learners.

(2) Accountability must be improved. There is a greater need for good statistics with the arrival of revenue sharing. Perhaps new data, e.g., concerning impact of program on learner, should be required. Models are needed.

(3) Differences between different types of programs should be taken into account, e.g., whether you concentrate on the hardest-to-reach. Perhaps a cost analysis of reaching the hardest to reach should be made, also the cost of working through different institutional settings.

(4) While NIE will do dissemination of research in education, it was pointed out that NIE does not have a section devoted to continuing education at all; at best, ABE might come under the Career Education area. We do need a center for resource utilization. Feedback from the field to the 309 program will lead to utilization and relevance.

(5) There is a need to mobilize state and local support for the ABE program, working with community agencies and associations.

(6) Coordination with high school equivalency programs is needed.

(7) There is a need to work with state officers, especially in the areas of establishing priorities and relaxation of state program requirements.

(8) There is a need for improved coordination of vocational education, manpower, and Title III to avoid duplication (this is a current priority of OE).

(9) A comprehensive research map should be developed within which priorities are established. A system of grants to graduate students to focus research effort on these priorities would mobilize on important neglected resource. Funded research might also include local need assessment studies and clientele analyses.

Group II

This group developed six project ideas and a suggestion for a new procedure concerning dissemination of 309(b) results.

Projects recommended:

(1) A dissemination project should be funded to catalog all 309(b) special demonstration projects completed, to identify output, package it for widespread dissemination, and undertake the actual dissemination process. In the past, it has been very difficult for local programs to know about, get hold of, and use these materials.

(2) A project is required to establish cost-benefit information for alternate ABE program formats. The purpose of this project would be to avoid funding 309(b) projects whose outcomes would be financially unrealistic in terms of local implementation.

(3) In order to minimize the negative effects of the numbers game, a project is necessary to identify and operationalize, and define meaningful outcome measures for local ABE program evaluation.

(4) A national project should study the minimum competencies required of all ABE staff members in successful programs, including the entire range of needed skills, knowledge, and attitudes.

(5) A project to develop systematic procedures to assist teachers to adapt existing instructional materials and methods to the needs of their own students would meet a pressing need.

(6) A project to develop and demonstrate effective procedures for creating on-the-job training administered through local ABE programs in cooperation with the Department of Labor, unions, and industries is recommended.

Dissemination system:

For future 309(b) projects whose outcomes are evaluated as successful and useful, a further dissemination stage should be added. A linkage with staff development monies to test and disseminate results further was suggested. It was pointed out that the cost of good dissemination can be as high as 50% of the development cost of a product and that dissemination requires a systematic procedure. Possibly Title III could provide expertise to projects, as well as additional funds at the dissemination stage. If national resources can be regionalized, these funds can be used to provide "adapters" to assist in the implementation of new processes and products at the local level according to the local programs' needs.

One philosophical question was raised: What is the business of the Bureau of Adult Education in this government? Why is the government involved in adult education at all? Why is and should a federal agency be concerned with the education of adults? This question

requires an answer if we are to establish the criteria for priorities of the Title III program.

Group III

Six high priority areas were identified from the Center's national survey of state and local ABE program directors. These were:

(1) Recruitment of the hard core

(2) In-service education concerning diagnosis of student learning needs and evaluation of student achievement

(3) Joint teacher-student prescription of student learning activities

(4) Retention

(5) Instructional materials (especially levels 1-3)

(6) ABE -- community relations

The work group supplemented this list, adding the following general concerns:

(1) Develop criteria for the selection of ABE delivery systems -- are we stuck with the public school system?

(2) Develop strategies to promote the participation of the clients in decision-making to insure that program decision-makers are from the same group as their clients or have an understanding of their needs.

(3) How can we better meet the needs of ESL students -- i.e., provide better bi-lingual, bi-cultural education?

(4) Promote the full-time funding of ABE programs.

(5) Make regions, states, and local programs more responsive to USOE/DAEP concerns.

(6) Establish criteria for evaluation and dissemination.

(7) Prmote accountability in the use of ABE funds.

(8) Secure accurate reporting of ABE statistics.

(9) Improve the recruitment, selection, training, and commitment of State Education Agency and State ABE staff to ABE. Perhaps separate adult education from the public school.

In the final 15 minutes, each group member was asked to identify his own most important priority. Priorities identified were:

(1) Develop better ways to deal with state and local ABE systems.

(2) Insure that local program decisions are made or at least strongly influenced by the clients.

(3) Change the ABE delivery system so that it will be more responsive to the needs of ABE participants.

(4) Look to the concept of human development rather than a narrow concept of literacy. There should be more supportive services.

(5) Develop total teacher competencies to meet the needs of learners.

(6) Increase the individual's repertoire of strategies available to effectively cope with problems in any domain.

(7) Clarify the goals of ABE and determine whether these can be achieved within the existing system. If changes are needed, can these be made? If a whole new system is needed, can one be created? If not, work with the existing system. Realism and pragmatism are key words.

(8) Improve our ability to work through the states.

(9) Restructure ABE so that its focus will be on the intentionality of persons.

Research Based Project Suggestions (Workshop Background Paper)

A rationale and elaboration of the central ideas presented below may be found in the Center for Adult Education's first annual report and/or in our Selected Action Implications for Urban ABE Directors.

(1) Fund selected urban ABE programs to demonstrate the value and uses of "feeder classes" for students coming into the program after the start of classes. All late enrollees would be brought into feeder classes where they would have special resources necessary for accurate assessment of achievement levels as basis for later placement in an ongoing class at an appropriate time. The feeder class would provide much needed counseling and program orientation for latecomers. Where necessary, transportation should be provided for students to attend feeder classes, e.g., minibus pick up and return at neighborhood school sites. Emphasis in the feeder class should be on individualized and small group instruction with intensive use made of aides -- paraprofessional and volunteer. Short term student goals, such as passing a civil service test or getting a driver's license, should be especially accommodated in the feeder classes. The feeder classes would involve intensive counseling and guidance resources.

(2) Fund an urban school system to demonstrate a comprehensive model urban program organization for ABE. Classes and resources would be centralized in one or a few major locations to take advantage of specialized services, including vocational counseling and job placement, guidance, health services, diagnostic and achievement testing, day care, use of teacher aides and audio-visual devices, achievement

grouping and others. Outreach classes, aside from those co-sponsored with employers or community organizations, would be short-term neighborhood located feeder classes as described above. Transportation would be provided from feeder locations to the centralized program. A university should institute a careful evaluation of qualitative and quantitative aspects of this effort.

(3) Fund state ABE directors to undertake pilot projects in selected urban ABE programs designed to develop curricula, materials and methods and train teachers in their use in the areas of coping skills, consumer, health, family life, human relations and civic education. Funds should include salary for a full-time curriculum development specialist, from within the ABE program if possible. Projects must include detailed plans for adoption of the benefits of these pilot projects throughout the ABE programs in each city involved and throughout the state program as well.

(4) Fund a state ABE director to demonstrate the feasibility of differential reporting and budgeting: local directors would announce what specific budget proportion is to be allocated for specific low and high risk programs: ESL/ABE, Grades IV-VIII/Grades I-III, multiple class sites/single or double class sites, established classes/new classes, co-sponsored classes/other outreach classes, typical response neighborhoods/"hard to reach" neighborhoods. Enrollment, retention, advancement and achievement would be reported for each of these categories of programs. Norms of comparative performance in each category should be established at state and local levels over a three year period, including cost factors. OE can earmark 309 funds for budget

supplements for innovative high risk programs. A university should be given a grant to cross tabulate variables and interpret findings. The state director could sub-contract this function.

(5) In a representative sample of larger urban centers in which we have knowledge that there are part-time directors, fund for three years the employment of full-time ABE directors. By comparing their performance with a control group of half-time directors, determine whether a change in guidelines is warranted making full-time directors mandatory in cities which have a certain size of target population. A university should make this study.

(6) Demonstrate an alternative model to the summer institutes for staff development. This would involve giving a grant to a university to tool up and provide necessary training and related services. The university would sub-contract with six to twelve local urban ABE programs, making 309 funds available to them to pay for salaries of personnel in lieu of teaching and other work and travel costs. (You could fund a state director who might sub-contract to both local directors and the university as well.) The university would provide pre- and in-service training with priorities and program development determined jointly by participating directors and university personnel. The university provide follow-up consultation and on-site training as well as demonstration, materials production, action research and operational analysis services for participating ABE programs. Experienced ABE personnel with special abilities could be rotated through the university's program as visiting staff members. In the first year OE should pay all costs; the state should agree to

pick up 30 percent of costs in second year, 50 percent the third year and assume all costs the fourth and subsequent year. Fund and evaluation of this model.

(7) Fund several cities to provide student transportation and child care and a university to undertake a comparative study to assess the enrollment and attendance advantages of these provisions over a three year period. Or do it all through a state ABE director who could allocate funds to selected cities and sub-contract with a university to do the analysis.

(8) Fund several cities and a university to ascertain the values in terms of recruitment, enrollment and retention rates and other achievement measures of intensive vocational counseling and job placement services within ABE programs manned by trained professionals.

(9) Fund an urban ABE program with limited guidance and counseling resources and a decentralized class program to convert counselors into trainers of teachers and resource backstoppers rather than attempting to deal with whatever problems they encounter in thinly covering classes in scattered sites. The counselor would provide needed information on community resources and contacts by compiling current information for teacher kits, provide telephone consultation for teachers, make appointments with students having special problems, train teachers and aides to administer tests, and help teachers interpret test results.

(10) Fund a private company to develop a set of high quality, professionally produced one-minute TV and radio spots and recruitment posters for use in buses and elsewhere. The grant should provide for

the production and distribution nationally of these materials -- with space for local inserts of information about the where and when of programs. These promotional materials should be especially designed for and pre-tested with ABE's particular target groups in English, Spanish and other languages of larger segments of the target population.

(11) Fund the demonstration of alternative ABE teaching methods: (1) appropriate use of groups in classroom instruction, (2) covering major concepts in an order determined by student involvement in defining problems, illustrating concepts and testing meanings in their personal experience, (3) other alternative methods of organizing instruction and mediating between content and student experience, e.g., "armchair" or "table-top" indigenous home study groups. The plan should involve the development of a manual of methods and techniques geared to ABE content and students and a set of video tapes demonstrating these for teacher training use. (This might be included in the specs under (5) above.)

(12) Fund the development of a dissemination strategy or model for ABE's 309(b) program -- based upon the most comprehensive and dependable body of data on program practice and problems currently available, an analysis of conditions of effectiveness of existing and past 309 projects -- a determination of priorities set by local directors and a review of related dissemination experience outside ABE.

Participants in the

CONSULTANTS WORKSHOP

Columbia University
June 8, 1973

Aliza Adelman
Program Associate
ABE Project
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Winthrop Adkins
Director
Life Skills Education and
Teacher Training Project
Teachers College
Columbia University

George F. Aker
Professor of Adult Education
Florida State University
920 West College Avenue
Tallahassee, Florida

Robert A. Aviña
Director
Por Fin Program
Bexar County Schools
Adult Basic Education
203 West Nueva
San Antonio, Texas

John Baird
Chief, Program Services Branch
Division of Adult Education
Bureau of Adult, Vocational and
Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
HEW, Washington, D.C.

Harold Beder
Assistant Director
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Morris Brown
Chief, Program Development Branch
Division of Adult Education
Bureau of Adult, Vocational and
Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
HEW, Washington, D.C.

Bayard Clark
Program Specialist
Program Services Branch
Division of Adult Education
Bureau of Adult, Vocational and
Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
HEW, Washington, D.C.

Noreen Clark
Research Officer
World Education
1414 Avenue of the Americas
New York, N.Y.

Albert Crambert
Senior Program Officer of Adult
Education
Regional Training Office
U.S. Office of Education
P.O. Box 19101
401 North Broad St.
Philadelphia, Penn.

Reva Crawford
Director of Adult Education
Tribal Office Building
Route 1, Box 21
Philadelphia, Miss.

Catherine Crone
Research Assistant
ABE Project
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Gordon G. Darkenwald
Associate Director
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Paul Delker
Director
Division of Adult Education
Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
U.S. Office of Education
HEW, Washington, D.C.

George Eyster
Director
Practical Assistance Center for Adult Education
Appalachian ABE Demonstration Center
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky

Ray Ferrier
Director of Adult Education
Schools Center - Room 1214
5057 Woodward
Detroit, Michigan

Jerry Hanberry
Director
Think Tank Project
Center for Adult Education
University College
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

John Hatfield
Project Director of Adult Education
S.M.I. Development Program
6800 North High Street
Worthington, Ohio

Gladys Irish
Program Associate
ABE Project
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Alan Knox
Professor of Adult Education
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Eliot Lethbridge
Director, Adult Education Center
Pochambeau Learning Center
White Plains, New York

Jack Mezirow
Director
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Mary M. Morris
Administrative Assistant
ABE Project
Center for Adult Education
Teachers College
Columbia University

Doris Moss
Director
Title III Adult Basic Education
New York City Board of Education
130 Clinton Street
Brooklyn, N.Y.

Kathleen Penfield
Assistant Professor of Adult Education
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N.J.

Theodore James Pinnock
Director
Human Resources Development Center
R.R. Moton Hall
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Alabama

Maryland Ransom
Teacher-Coordinator
Adult Education Center
580 Springdale Avenue
East Orange, N.J.

Jessie Ulin
Project Director
Conference and Institute Division
University College
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland

Warren Ziegler
Director
Educational Policy Research Center
1206 Harrison Street
Syracuse University
Syracuse, N.Y.

APPENDIX I

Page

I-A URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL DIRECTORS COMPARED: HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS

Table A-1	GENERAL PRIORITIES	146
Table A-2	TARGET GROUPS	147
Table A-3	SELECTED PRACTICES	148
Table A-4	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	149
Table A-5	RECRUITMENT	150
Table A-6	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION	151
Table A-7	INSTRUCTION	152
Table A-8	INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS	153

I-B CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS

Table B- 1	CONCENTRATION ON HARDEST TO REACH	154
Table B- 2	INCREASE COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR ABE PROGRAM	155
Table B- 3	RECRUIT UNEMPLOYED	156
Table B- 4	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS	157
Table B- 5	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING DIAGNOSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS	158
Table B- 6	PRESCRIBE LEARNING ACTIVITIES TO MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS	159
Table B- 7	BUILD STUDENT SELF-CONFIDENCE	160
Table B- 8	RETAIN STUDENTS IN PROGRAM	161
Table B- 9	INCREASE STUDENT MOTIVATION	162
Table B-10	DIAGNOSE STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS	163
Table B-11	USE METHODS APPROPRIATE TO ADULTS	164
Table B-12	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS	165
Table B-13	RECRUIT MOST ILLITERATE	166

I-C CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS

Table C-1	BUILD STUDENT SELF-CONFIDENCE	167
Table C-2	PRESCRIBE LEARNING ACTIVITIES TO MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS	168
Table C-3	DIAGNOSE STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS	169
Table C-4	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (SELECTING, ADAPTING, AND USING)	170
Table C-5	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING SELECTING METHODS APPROPRIATE FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS	171
Table C-6	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING BUILDING STUDENT SELF-CONFIDENCE	172
Table C-7	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING DIAGNOSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS	173
Table C-8	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING METHODS OF INSTRUCTION	174
Table C-9	GENERAL PRIORITY: INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS	175

Table A-1

URBAN, RURAL AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: GENERAL PRIORITIES
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=160)	HIGH (N=215)	TOP (N=134)	HIGH (N=200)	TOP (N=60)	HIGH (N=95)
Recruitment	50.6	79.9	57.5	82.8	41.7	72.0
Instruction	18.8	65.5	17.9	67.3	28.3	64.0
Instructional Materials	-	-	-	-	10.0	51.0
In-Service Education	-	-	10.4	46.5	10.0	47.0

Table A-2

URBAN, RURAL AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: TARGET GROUPS
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=159)	HIGH (N=210)	TOP (N=143)	HIGH (N=190)	TOP (N= 60)	HIGH (N= 90)
Unemployed	10.1	67.8	7.0	67.8	1.7	68.7
Least Literate	18.9	66.2	11.9	67.9	8.3	69.3
Rural Adults	-	-	46.9	86.5	-	-
Urban Adults	13.8	64.8	-	-	-	-
Non-English-Speaking	-	-	-	-	18.3	81.3
Blacks	21.4	64.2	8.4	38.5	15.0	42.4
Welfare Recipients	8.8	62.6	-	-	-	-
Indians	-	-	7.0	-	-	-
Mexican Americans	-	-	-	-	26.7	56.3

Table A-3

URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: SELECTED PRACTICES
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=156)	HIGH (N=217)	TOP (N=135)	HIGH (N=199)	TOP (N=58)	HIGH (N=98)
Concentration on Hardest to Reach Target Groups	25.0	72.9	13.3	64.9	12.1	77.5
Integration of ABE & GED Program	13.5	60.8	25.2	68.5	17.2	62.9
Provision of ESL Classes	-	-	-	-	13.8	72.9
Provision of Vocational Counseling and Job Placement Services	6.4	64.2	11.1	60.5	-	-
Employment of Full-time Recruiters	7.7	-	-	-	-	-
Program designed Specifically for a Special Target Group	-	-	-	-	10.3	60.7
Provision of Transportation	7.1	36.9	7.4	34.7	-	-

Table A-4

URBAN, RURAL, AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=151)	HIGH (N=217)	TOP (N=132)	HIGH (N=198)	TOP (N=60)	HIGH (N=99)
Increase Community Support for the ABE Program	13.2	76.6	15.9	66.1	13.3	63.7
Evaluate Overall Program Effectiveness	13.2	72.1	12.1	61.7	11.7	63.7
Obtain Additional Resources to Supplement Existing Funds	14.6	65.2	10.6	59.9	13.3	58.5
Coordinate ABE and GED Programs	-	-	12.9	62.7	-	-
Involve Students in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	7.9	59.6	-	-	11.7	50.5
Select Competent Classroom Teachers	10.6	45.3	-	-	-	-

Table A-5

URBAN, RURAL AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: RECRUITMENT
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=147)	HIGH (N=212)	TOP (N=126)	HIGH (N=194)	TOP (N=57)	HIGH (N=94)
Recruit Unemployed	8.8	82.9	4.0	75.2	1.8	68.4
Recruit Most Illiterate	21.1	81.6	21.4	75.9	21.1	81.4
Work through other Agencies to Recruit Students	10.2	69.1	6.3	74.3	7.0	70.4
Recruit Rural Adults	-	-	17.5	87.9	-	-
Recruit Young Males	-	-	7.9	60.8	-	-
Determine what Groups in the Community Need ABE	8.2	60.5	8.7	59.5	12.3	60.2
Recruit Urban Adults	12.2	77.7	-	-	-	-
Recruit Blacks	8.2	-	-	-	-	-
Recruit non-English Speaking	-	-	-	-	15.8	82.8
Use Paraprofessional Recruiters	5.4	49.6	6.3	55.5	5.3	57.3

Table A-6

URBAN, RURAL AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: IN- SERVICE EDUCATION
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=153)	HIGH (N=217)	TOP (N=119)	HIGH (N=194)	TOP (N=61)	HIGH (N=97)
Provide In-Service Education in Teachers	5.9	79.2	8.4	82.8	3.3	76.2
In-Service Education concerning Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	21.6	81.2	20.2	76.9	16.4	74.5
In-Service Education concerning Instructional Methods	9.2	72.8	10.1	73.6	8.2	72.8
In-Service Education concerning Evaluation of Student Achievement	1.3	71.6	-	-	3.3	71.1
In-Service Education concerning Adult Learning and Development	15.7	68.8	13.4	69.7	6.6	72.7
In-Service Education concerning Instructional Materials	-	-	8.4	67.3	16.4	71.9
Use Local Workshops as part of In-Service Education Effort	-	-	5.9	67.5	-	-

Table A-7

URBAN, RURAL AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: INSTRUCTION
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=150)	HIGH (N=217)	TOP (N=126)	HIGH (N=199)	TOP (N=58)	HIGH (N=98)
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	8.0	84.0	11.1	84.1	6.9	80.0
Build Student Self-Confidence	4.0	81.6	2.0	84.0	3.4	74.7
Retain Students in Program	16.7	79.7	19.8	82.3	25.9	84.1
Increase Student Motivation	5.3	80.6	11.1	79.3	6.9	74.0
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	2.7	82.4	7.9	78.8	5.2	75.3
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	3.3	75.7	0	75.0	3.4	72.6
Evaluate Instructional Program	2.7	71.0	2.4	66.2	-	-
Use Small Group Instruction	8.0	52.3	9.5	56.9	15.5	62.7
Place Students in Jobs or Training Programs	7.3	54.8	-	-	-	-
Use Programmed Materials	6.7	49.3	-	-	-	-
Use Learning Laboratory	10.0	45.2	-	-	12.1	53.1

Table A-8

URBAN, RURAL AND ESL PROGRAM DIRECTORS COMPARED
HIGHEST PRIORITY ITEMS: INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
(in percent)

	URBAN		RURAL		ESL	
	TOP (N=147)	HIGH (N=217)	TOP (N=121)	HIGH (N=196)	TOP (N=60)	HIGH (N=97)
Develop Materials: Beginning Reading	15.6	68.6	19.8	69.6	6.7	74.5
Develop Materials: Intermediate Reading	3.4	65.8	7.4	68.2	1.7	74.3
Provide dependable information regarding Quality and Applicability of Instructional Materials	13.6	66.9	15.7	67.0	-	-
Develop Materials in Consumer Education	10.9	65.2	10.7	68.0	-	-
Adapt Materials for Local Use	7.5	59.7	9.1	61.8	-	-
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	6.8	64.3	11.6	59.4	11.7	57.6
Develop Materials in "Coping" Skills	6.8	57.7	-	-	-	-
Develop New Materials Locally for Local Use	9.5	55.3	-	-	13.3	51.5
Develop Materials in English as a Second Language	-	-	-	-	33.3	80.8

Table B-1

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
CONCENTRATION ON HARDEST TO REACH

	URBAN (N=205)	RURAL (N=178)	ESL (N=90)
More Effectively Reach and Educate Puerto Ricans	-	-	.3890
More Effectively Reach and Educate Urban Adults	-	.4049	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Least Literate	.3518	-	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Handicapped	-	.3209	-
Provide ESL Classes	-	.3361	-
Provide Program Designed Specially for a Special Target Group	.3752	-	-
More Effective Beginning Level Classes	.3009		
Use Volunteers in ABE Program	-	-	.3957
Employ Full-time Recruiters	-	-	.3554
Develop Interagency Referral Relations	-	.3892	-
Provide Childcare	-	-	.3784
Use Paraprofessionals as Recruiters	-	.3575	-
Work through Other Agencies to Recruit Students	-	-	.4190
Recruit Most Illiterate	.5298	.3965	.4171
Recruit Unemployed	.2908	-	-
Recruit Non-English Speaking	.2934	-	-
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	-	.3581	-
Develop More Effective Materials in Beginning Reading	.3134	-	-

Table B-2

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
INCREASE COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR ABE PROGRAM

	URBAN (N=203)	RURAL (N=184)	ESL (N=90)
More Effectively Reach and Educate Puerto Ricans	.3742	-	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Urban Adults	-	.3795	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Handicapped	-	.3537	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Prison Inmates	.3877	-	-
Employ Paraprofessionals	.3387	-	-
Coordinate ABE and GED programs	-	-	.4246
Obtain Suitable Instructional Facilities	.3478	.3697	-
Develop Productive Co-Sponsorship Relations	.4191	.3678	.5409
Provide Transportation for Students	.3276	-	-
Work through Other Agencies to Recruit Students	-	-	.4365
Use Television and Radio Spots in Recruitment	-	-	.4272
Use Print Media, e.g.,Newspapers, Posters in Recruitment	-	-	.5054
Recruit Urban Adults	-	.3370	.4743
Use Coaching of Less Experienced Staff as Part of In-Service Education Program	-	.3574	-
Use College and University Courses as Part of In-Service Education Program	.3255	-	-
Increase Student Motivation	-	.3576	-
Develop More Effective Instructional Materials in Advanced Arithmetic (7-8)	-	-	.4499

Table B-3

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
RECRUIT UNEMPLOYED

	URBAN (N=198)	RURAL (N=185)	ESL (N=88)
More Effectively Reach and Educate Blacks	.35	-	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Unemployed	.58	.39	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Young Males	.35	-	-
More Effectively Reach and Educate Welfare Recipients	.46	.41	.52
Use Paraprofessionals as Recruiters	-	-	.45
Work through Other Agencies to Recruit Students	-	.45	.44
Recruit Most Illiterate	.33	.39	-
Recruit Young Males	-	.51	-
Recruit Blacks	.36	-	-
Recruit Asians	.36	-	.59
Provide In-Service Education re: Teaching "Coping" skills	-	-	.47
More Effectively Teach "Coping" skills	-	.40	-
Use ABE Teachers to Counsel Students	-	.43	-
Place Students in Jobs or Training Programs	-	-	.53
Develop More Effective Materials for Instruction in "Coping" skills	-	-	.45

Table B-4

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
PROVIDE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR TEACHERS

	URBAN (N=212)	RURAL (N=196)	ESL (N=96)
Involve Staff in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	-	-	.51
Find Out Staff Needs for In-Service Education	.51	.50	.60
Planned In-Service Education Program	-	.49	-
Use Local Workshops in In-Service Education	.54	.47	.49
Provide In-Service Education for Paraprofessionals	.45	.49	.58
Provide In-Service Education for Counselors	.51	.46	.49
Provide In-Service Education for Supervisors	.57	.53	.51
In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	-	.50	-
In-Service Education re: Instructional Methods	-	-	.55
In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.51	-	-
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	.45	-	-

Table B-5

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING DIAGNOSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS

	URBAN (N=213)	RURAL (N=192)	ESL (N=96)
Work in the Classroom of a More Experienced Teacher	-	-	.55
Coaching of Less Experienced Staff	-	.44	-
In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	.42	-	.55
In-Service Education re: Understanding the Student Population	.43	-	-
In-Service Education re: Instructional Methods	-	.44	-
In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	-	.52	-
In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	.67	.67	.70
Improved Ways to Diagnose Student Learning Needs	.62	.68	.73
Improved Ways to Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	.54	.60	.64
Increase Student Motivation	-	-	.57
Foster Student Participation in Setting Objectives and Evaluating Learning Activities	.49	-	.56
Evaluate Student Progress	.51	.48	-

Table B-6

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
PRESCRIBE LEARNING ACTIVITIES TO MEET
INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

	URBAN (N=213)	RURAL (N=197)	ESL (N=98)
In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	-	-	.53
In-Service Education re: Instructional Methods	.54	.46	-
In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	.49	.48	-
In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.54	.60	.64
In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	.51	.49	.50
Improved Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.72	.61	.73
Foster Student Participation in Setting Objectives and Evaluation Learning Activities	-	.42	-
Increase Student Motivation	-	-	.53
Evaluate Student Progress	.57	-	-
Evaluate Instructional Program	.45	-	-
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	-	.45	-
Adapt Materials for Local Use	-	-	.54
Develop New Materials Locally for Local Use	-	-	.53

Table B-7

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
BUILD STUDENT SELF-CONFIDENCE

	URBAN (N=213)	RURAL (N=195)	ESL (N=99)
Provide In-Service Education for Counselors	-	.42	-
In-Service Education re: Understanding the Student Population	.42	-	-
In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	.42	-	-
In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	-	.44	-
Orient New Students to Program	-	-	.53
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	-	.40	.45
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	.42	-	-
Increase Student Motivation	.52	.53	.60
Teach "Coping" Skills	-	.43	.56
Evaluate Student Progress	.44	.43	-
Retain Students in Program	-	.43	-
Use ABE Teachers to Counsel Students	-	-	.55
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	.42	-	-
Adapt Materials for Local Use	.42	-	-
Develop Materials in Family Life Education	-	-	.48
Develop Materials in "Coping" Skills	-	-	.49

Table B-8

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
RETAIN STUDENTS IN PROGRAM

	URBAN (N=212)	RURAL (N=195)	ESL (N=98)
Develop Interagency Referral Relations	-	.39	-
Work through Other Agencies to Recruit Students	-	-	.38
Recruit Unemployed	-	.37	-
Recruit Urban Adults	-	-	.44
Evaluate In-Service Education Programs	-	.36	-
Use Local Workshops in In-Service Education	-	-	.37
Use State and Regional Programs in In-Service Education	-	.37	-
Provide In-Service Education for Paraprofessionals	-	-	.45
More Effective In-Service Education re: Instructional Methods	.37	-	-
More Effective In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	.37	-	-
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	.34	-	.43
Increase Student Motivation	.36	-	-
Build Student Self-Confidence	.36	.43	-
Evaluate Student Progress	-	.39	-
Use ABE Teachers to Counsel Students	.34	.36	-
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	-	-	.44
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	.34	-	-
Develop More Effective Materials in Beginning Reading	-	-	.39

Table B-9

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
INCREASE STUDENT MOTIVATION

	URBAN (N=213)	RURAL (N=192)	ESL (N=98)
Provide More Effective In-Service Education re: Understanding the Student Population	.40	-	-
Provide In-Service Education re: Use of Instructional Technology	-	.39	-
Provide In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.39	-	.57
Provide In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	-	-	.58
Orient New Students to Program	-	.39	-
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	.42	-	.64
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	.41	-	.53
Foster Student Participation in Setting Objectives and Educating Learning Activities	.48	.42	.65
Build Student Self-Confidence	.52	.53	.60
Evaluate Student Progress	.43	.36	-
Minimize Disruption due to Continuous Enrollment of New Students	-	.37	-
Adapt Materials for Local Use	-	-	.62
Develop More Effective Materials in Civics	-	.38	-

Table B-10

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
DIAGNOSE STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS

	URBAN (N=212)	RURAL (N=197)	ESL (N=98)
In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	-	-	.60
In-Service Education re: Instructional Methods	.45	-	-
In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	-	.46	-
In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.62	.68	.73
In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	.48	.59	.62
Orient New Students to Program	-	.45	-
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	.72	.61	.73
Foster Student Participation in Setting Objectives and Evaluating Learning Activities	.46	-	.65
Increase Student Motivation	.42	-	.64
Evaluate Student Progress	.56	.53	-
Use Methods Appropriate to Adults	-	.48	-
Adapt Materials for Local Use	-	-	.61

Table B-11

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
USE METHODS APPROPRIATE TO ADULTS

	URBAN (N=211)	RURAL (N=179)	ESL (N=92)
Select Competent Classroom Teachers	.41	-	-
Evaluate Instructional Staff	-	-	.50
Involve Staff in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	.42	-	-
Recruit Urban Adults	-	-	.49
Provide In-Service Education for Counselors	-	.50	-
Provide In-Service Education for Supervisors	-	.48	-
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	-	.48	-
Evaluate Student Progress	-	.50	-
Build Student Self-Confidence	.42	-	-
Use ABE Teachers to Counsel Students	.49	-	-
Evaluate Instructional Program	.43	.46	-
Key Curriculum to Behavioral Objectives	.48	.50	.67
Use Small Group Instruction	.50	-	-
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	-	.47	.51
Adapt Materials for Local Use	-	-	.50
Develop New Materials Locally for Local Use	-	-	.48
Develop Materials in Civics	-	-	.47

Table B-12

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
IN-SERVICE EDUCATION RE: INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

	URBAN (N=213)	RURAL (N=190)	ESL (N=97)
More Effective Practice in the Area of Instruction	-	.46	-
Involve Students in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	-	-	.44
Find Out Staff Needs for In-Service Education	-	-	.43
Provide In-Service Education for Teachers	-	-	.55
In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	-	-	.44
In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	.64	.65	.59
In-Service Education re: Instructional Technology	.43	.45	-
In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.42	.44	-
Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.45	-	-
Prescription of Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	.54	.46	-
Evaluation of Instructional Program	.44	-	.51
Use of Methods Appropriate to Adults	-	.45	.52
Use of Programmed Materials	.45	-	-
Provision of Dependable Information on Quality and Applicability of Instructional Materials	-	.48	-

Table B-13

CORRELATES OF LOCAL DIRECTORS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
RECRUIT MOST ILLITERATE

	URBAN (N=205)	RURAL (N=187)	ESL (N=93)
More Effectively Reach and Serve the Least Literate	.51	.44	.53
Concentrate on Hardest to Reach Target Groups	.53	.40	.42
Emphasize Beginning Level Classes	.38	-	-
Employ Paraprofessionals	.33	-	-
Involve Students in Setting Program Goals and Priorities	-	.38	-
Work through other Agencies to Recruit Students	-	-	.44
Use Television and Radio Spots in Recruitment	.34	-	-
Recruit Unemployed	.33	.39	-
Provide In-Service Education for Teachers	-	-	.42
Provide In-Service Education for Paraprofessionals	-	-	.43
Provide In-Service Education for Counselors	-	-	.41
Provide In-Service Education for Supervisors	-	-	.40
Improved In-Service Education Programs re: Instructional Methods	-	.39	-
Build Student Self-Confidence	-	.37	-
Evaluate Student Progress	-	.37	-
Develop Materials in Beginning Reading	.33	-	-

Table C-1

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
BUILD STUDENT SELF-CONFIDENCE

	BASIC ED. (N=220)	ESL (N=59)
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	-	.52
Increase Student Motivation	.47	-
Foster Student Socialization	-	.45
Teach Health Education	.35	-
Teach "Coping" Skills	.35	-
In-Service Education re: Building Student Self-Confidence	.62	.56
In-Service Education re: Teaching Civic Skills	.35	-
In-Service Education re: Teaching Health Education	.35	-
Provide Vocational Counseling for Students	-	.49
Place Students in Jobs or Training Programs	-	.47
More Effective Materials in Beginning Arithmetic	-	.44
More Effective Materials in Intermediate Arithmetic	-	.45
More Effective Materials in Health Education	.37	-

Table C-2

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
PRESCRIBE LEARNING ACTIVITIES TO MEET INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

	BASIC ED. (N=226)	ESL (N=60)
More Effective Instruction Practices	.43	.43
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	.54	.49
Foster Student Participation in Setting Learning Objectives	.46	.46
Foster Student Participation in Evaluating Learning Activities	.42	-
Evaluate Student Progress	.46	-
Evaluate Instructional Program	.49	.43
Key Curriculum to Behavioral Objectives	.38	-
Provide In-Service Education re: Selecting Methods Appropriate for Individual Students	-	.49
Provide In-Service Education re: Selecting Objectives Appropriate for Individual Students	-	.46
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	-	.47

Table C-3

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
DIAGNOSE STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS

	BASIC ED. (N=228)	ESL (N=60)
Prescribe Learning Activities to Meet Individual Needs	.54	.49
Build Student Self-Confidence	-	.52
Evaluate Student Progress	.42	-
Evaluate Instructional Program	.37	.48
Teach Intermediate Reading	.36	-
Use Small Group to Engage in Problem Solving	-	.49
Train Counselors	.36	-
Provide In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.46	.58
Provide In-Service Education re: Improving Teacher-Student Relations	.37	-
Provide In-Service Education re: How to Teach Computational Skills	-	.52
Develop Materials in Intermediate Reading	-	.45

Table C-4

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (SELECTING, ADAPTING AND USING)

	BASIC ED. (N=214)	ESL (N=57)
Develop More Effective Instructional Materials	.40	-
Evaluate the In-Service Program	.38	-
Provide In-Service Education re: ABE Program Objectives, Current Operations	-	.54
Provide In-Service Education re: Methods of Instruction	.49	.73
Provide In-Service Education re: Instructional Technology	.41	.57
Provide In-Service Education re: Student Retention	-	.54
Provide In-Service Education re: Teaching Beginning Reading	.40	-
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	.43	-
Provide Dependable Information re: Quality and Applicability of Instructional Materials	.37	-
Develop New Materials Locally for Local Use	-	.56
Develop Materials in Health Education	-	.61

Table C-5

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING
SELECTING METHODS APPROPRIATE
FOR INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

	BASIC ED. (N=219)	ESL (N=55)
Program Area: Instruction	.40	-
Find Out Needs of Potential Participants in In-Service Education Programs	-	.53
Plan the Content of the In-Service Program	-	.54
In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	.45	.63
In-Service Education re: Building Student Self-Confidence	.41	.58
In-Service Education Selecting Objectives Appropriate to Individual Students	.63	.85
In-Service Education re: How to Teach Intermediate Reading	.44	-
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	-	.54
Adapt Materials for Local Use	.42	.53
Develop Materials for the Least Literate	.41	-

Table C-6

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING
BUILDING STUDENT SELF-CONFIDENCE

	BASIC ED. (N=220)	ESL (N=56)
Build Student Self-Confidence	.62	-
Use Small Groups to Engage in Problem Solving	.44	-
Find Out Needs of Potential Participants in In-Service Education	-	.62
Provide In-Service Education re: Diagnosis of Student Learning Needs	-	.59
Provide In-Service Education re: Selecting Methods Appropriate for Individual Students	.41	.58
Provide In-Service Education re: Counseling Students in Academic or Personal Matters	.41	.63
Provide In-Service Education re: Improving Teacher-Student Relations	.39	-
Provide Personal Counseling for Students	.39	-
Develop Materials in Advanced Reading	-	.61
Develop Materials in Beginning Arithmetic	-	.60
Develop Materials in Intermediate Arithmetic	-	.61

Table C-7

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING
DIAGNOSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING NEEDS

	BASIC ED. (N=218)	ESL (N=57)
Diagnose Student Learning Needs	.46	-
Find out Needs of Potential Participants in In-Service Education	.44	.63
Provide In-Service Education re: Student Program Prescription	.52	-
Provide In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	.47	.64
Provide In-Service Education re: Selecting Methods Appropriate for Individual Students	.45	.63
Provide In-Service Education re: Selecting Objectives Appropriate for Individual Students	-	.69
Provide In-Service Education re: Teaching Beginning Reading	-	.60
Develop Materials in Beginning Reading	-	.62
Develop Materials in Intermediate Reading	-	.61
Use Paraprofessionals in Counseling	.40	-
Use Paraprofessionals in Materials Preparation	.39	-

Table C-8

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
IN-SERVICE EDUCATION CONCERNING
METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

	BASIC ED. (N=214)	ESL (N=56)
More Effective Program Practice: Instruction	.43	-
Provide In-Service Education for Teachers	.50	.52
Provide In-Service Education re: Adult Learning and Development	.40	.45
Provide In-Service Education re: Philosophy of Adult Education	.43	-
Provide In-Service Education re: Understanding the Student Population	.43	-
Provide In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials	.49	.73
Provide In-Service Education re: Use of Instructional Technology	-	.46
Provide In-Service Education re: Student Program Prescription	-	.46
Use Paraprofessionals in Materials Development	-	.56
Use Learning Lab to Provide Instructional Variety	-	.66
Evaluate Instructional Effectiveness of Learning Lab	.45	-

Table C-9

CORRELATES OF TEACHERS' HIGH PRIORITY ITEMS
GENERAL PRIORITY: INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

	BASIC ED. (N=218)	ESL (N=57)
More Effective In-Service Education	.33	-
More Effective Instruction	.34	-
Increase Student Motivation	-	.62
Evaluate Instructional Program	.34	-
Use Programmed Materials	.31	-
Use College and University Courses in In-Service Education	-	.48
Provide In-Service Education re: ABE Program Objectives, Current Operation	-	.48
Provide In-Service Education re: Instructional Materials (Selecting, Adapting and Using)	.31	.52
Provide In-Service Education re: Student Program Prescription	-	.48
Provide In-Service Education re: Evaluation of Student Achievement	-	.53
Provide In-Service Education re: How to Teach Civics	-	.51
Identify and Locate Instructional Materials	.33	-
Develop Materials in Beginning Arithmetic	.36	-

APPENDIX II

		Page
II-A	QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE: LOCAL DIRECTORS AND TEACHERS	177
II-B	FACSIMILE OF LOCAL DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE: MARGINALS	183
II-C	FACSIMILE OF TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE: MARGINALS	195

APPENDIX II-A

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE

LOCAL DIRECTORS

Region	Number of Questionnaires Sent Out	Number of Responses Received	Response Rate (percent)
Region I	101	48	48%
Connecticut	53	15	28
Maine	7	5	71
Massachusetts	18	12	66
New Hampshire	13	9	69
Rhode Island	7	5	71
Vermont	3	2	66
Region II	78	43	55%
New York	30	17	56
New Jersey	48	26	54
Region III	115	72	63%
Delaware	4	1	25
Washington, D.C.	2	1	50
Maryland	12	10	83
Pennsylvania	37	25	68
West Virginia	5	4	80
Virginia	55	31	56

LOCAL DIRECTORS RESPONSE RATE (Cont.)

Region	Number of Questionnaires Sent Out	Number of Responses Received	Response Rate (percent)
Region IV	330	187	56%
Alabama	51	33	65
Florida	40	21	53
Georgia	46	25	54
Kentucky	45	32	71
Tennessee	48	25	52
Mississippi	21	10	48
North Carolina	37	27	73
South Carolina	42	14	33
Region V	179	127	71%
Illinois	40	22	55
Indiana	20	15	75
Michigan	48	35	73
Minnesota	13	9	69
Ohio	49	38	78
Wisconsin	9	8	88
Region VI	201	114	58%
Arkansas	44	22	50
Louisiana	38	21	55
New Mexico	13	6	46
Oklahoma	23	14	61
Texas	83	51	62

LOCAL DIRECTORS RESPONSE RATE (Cont.)

Region	Number of Questionnaires Sent Out	Number of Responses Received	Response Rate (percent)
Region VII	69	52	75%
Iowa	8	8	100
Kansas	20	15	75
Missouri	33	22	66
Nebraska	8	7	88
Region VIII	88	60	73%
Colorado	25	16	64
Montana	15	11	96
North Dakota	8	5	63
South Dakota	13	12	93
Utah	20	9	45
Wyoming	7	7	100
Region IX	67	49	73%
Arizona	12	12	100
California	46	32	70
Nevada	9	5	55
Region X	34	24	71%
Washington	16	12	75
Idaho	10	5	50
Oregon	8	7	86

APPENDIX II-A

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATE

TEACHERS

Region	Number of Questionnaires Sent Out	Number of Responses Received	Response Rate (percent)
Region I	55	24	44%
Connecticut	9	6	67
Maine	7	1	14
Massachusetts	11	3	27
New Hampshire	3	1	33
Rhode Island	8	5	63
Vermont	17	8	47
Region II	44	20	45%
New York	29	16	55
New Jersey	15	4	27
Region III	132	14	11%
Delaware	0	0	0
Maryland	2	0	0
Pennsylvania	77*	0	0
West Virginia	0	0	0
Virginia	53	14	26

*Philadelphia - program discontinued.

Region	Number of Questionnaires Sent Out	Number of Responses Received	Response Rate (percent)
Region IV	275	105	38%
Alabama	48	16	33
Florida	38	10	26
Georgia	42	16	38
Kentucky	23	11	48
Tennessee	49	13	27
Mississippi	20	9	45
North Carolina	54	30	56
South Carolina	1	0	0
Region V	182	80	44%
Illinois	84	30	36
Indiana	8	8	100
Michigan	28	7	25
Minnesota	4	2	50
Ohio	21	12	57
Wisconsin	37	21	57
Region VI	167	84	50%
Arkansas	16	4	25
Louisiana	19	7	37
New Mexico	4	3	75
Oklahoma	39	19	49
Texas	89	51	57

TEACHER RESPONSE RATE

Region	Number of Questionnaires Sent Out	Number of Responses Received	Response Rate (percent)
Region VII	75	40	53%
Iowa	21	12	57
Kansas	9	5	56
Missouri	39	18	46
Nebraska	6	5	83
Region VIII	50	17	34%
Colorado	27	7	26
Montana	0	0	0
North Dakota	6	2	33
South Dakota	10	4	40
Utah	1	0	0
Wyoming	6	4	67
Region IX	105	37	35%
Arizona	8	4	50
California	82	29	35
Nevada	15	4	27
Region X	36	17	47%
Washington	12	7	58
Idaho	24	10	42
Oregon	0	0	0
NATIONAL TOTALS	1121	446	40%

APPENDIX II-B

FACSIMILE OF LOCAL DIRECTOR QUESTIONNAIRE: MARGINALS

The following pages are facsimile reproductions of the questionnaire sent to local directors.

For every item, the percentages of local directors who assigned each priority or who indicated that the item was inapplicable are recorded. Non-respondents are excluded from the percentages.

For every section, respondents were instructed to circle the number of the ONE item which was their single highest (TOP) priority. Where 12.5% or more of local directors concurred in nominating an item as the single TOP priority item in that section, this is reported here by an asterisk next to the item number. The percent of local directors so nominating the item is given to the left of the asterisk.

Section I: General Priorities

	PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN EACH OF THESE PROGRAM AREAS:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highes Priori
50.5*	1. recruitment	2.6	7.0	12.1	30.7	47.5
	2. in-service education	1.9	12.2	39.9	33.1	12.9
19.3*	3. instruction	1.2	8.2	25.2	37.0	28.4
	4. instructional materials	1.8	11.8	31.9	39.7	14.7
	5. program management	4.0	23.0	39.2	26.5	7.3
	6. counseling	3.5	15.5	36.0	34.3	10.8
	7. collaboration with other agencies	4.7	16.9	35.0	31.2	12.2

Section II: Target Group

	PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO REACH AND EDUCATE THE FOLLOWING:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
4.7*	1. Blacks	23.8	11.0	15.4	27.5	22.4
	2. Mexican Americans	54.6	11.7	7.5	13.0	13.3
	3. Puerto Ricans	70.6	13.7	6.5	5.3	4.0
	4. Indians	68.1	11.6	7.5	6.8	6.0
	5. Asians	64.1	14.9	13.2	6.5	1.2
	6. Urban adults	30.3	8.3	17.8	27.1	16.5
20.1*	7. Rural adults	15.4	8.7	15.5	32.4	28.0
	8. Migrants	52.3	15.3	11.8	14.4	6.1
	9. Unemployed	4.4	8.0	20.4	42.9	24.4
5.3*	10. Least literate	4.7	9.0	21.1	33.5	31.6
	11. Non-English speaking	32.2	13.4	15.9	22.5	16.0
	12. Young males	5.7	13.0	31.7	37.0	12.6
	13. Welfare recipients	4.5	8.8	26.8	38.9	20.9
	14. Handicapped	16.0	22.3	32.7	20.7	8.4
	15. Prison inmates	61.9	11.4	10.2	9.2	7.3
	16. Other group (specify:_____)	69.8	0.5	2.6	12.2	14.8

Section III: Selected Practices

	PRIORITY YOU WOULD ASSIGN EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS TO DEMONSTRATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THESE PRACTICES	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highe Prior
	1. planned in-service education program	3.2	11.6	36.1	34.8	14.
	2. provision of transportation	17.8	24.3	23.1	19.6	15.
	3. provision of child care facilities	16.5	21.4	25.2	24.8	12.
	4. local materials development	5.0	19.7	41.1	28.4	5.
	5. provision of vocational counseling and job placement services	4.8	9.2	25.0	42.6	18.
	6. instruction in "coping" skills e.g., how to apply for a job	2.3	7.2	34.7	41.9	13.
	7. provision of ESL classes	16.2	14.1	31.5	25.5	12.
16.8*	8. concentration on hardest to reach target groups	4.6	5.3	19.7	37.2	33.
	9. program designed specifically for a special target group e.g., Chicanos, migrants, handicapped, etc. (Specify:_____)	30.3	13.5	17.6	18.6	20.
18.2*	10. integration of ABE and GED program	4.7	12.1	18.3	34.6	30.
	11. parent education	10.2	15.8	30.9	34.0	9.
	12. decentralized classes	17.6	24.3	33.8	17.6	6.
	13. instruction in learning labs	9.1	18.5	32.1	30.0	10.
	14. emphasis on beginning level classes	2.8	14.9	37.5	30.3	14.
	15. non-classroom instruction (e.g., educational TV, home instruction)	15.2	30.6	31.0	17.0	6.
	16. co-sponsored classes	19.6	26.4	32.9	17.0	4.
	17. employment of full-time staff	17.0	22.6	22.1	23.2	15.
	18. employment of paraprofessionals	11.2	18.4	33.8	26.0	10.
	19. use of volunteers	13.5	25.6	34.9	19.3	6.
	20. employment of full-time recruiters	14.0	18.4	21.4	26.3	19.

Section IV: Program Management

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT: PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
1. select competent classroom teachers	4.2	22.9	29.3	23.7	19.9
2. select competent paraprofessionals	10.9	25.5	31.0	23.1	9.5
3. use volunteers	15.8	28.5	33.5	17.6	4.6
4. evaluate instructional staff	3.4	16.3	35.2	35.6	9.5
5. coordinate ABE and GED programs	4.6	14.4	23.6	35.0	22.4
6. develop management information systems to provide feedback for program decision making	4.8	19.5	37.0	29.6	9.1
7. use PPBS (Programming-planning-budgeting-system)	16.5	29.0	32.2	18.0	4.3
8. develop dependable information about administrative and instructional practices in other ABE programs	4.0	15.3	35.4	36.4	8.9
9. disseminate information concerning effective and/or innovative program practices	3.8	10.9	32.0	40.7	12.6
10. coordinate Title III with other ABE and related programs	12.4	13.7	33.3	30.6	10.1
11. obtain additional resources to supplement existing funds	4.6	9.9	23.9	33.5	28.0
12. obtain suitable instructional facilities	11.7	22.3	27.0	25.1	13.9
14.2* 13. increase community support for the ABE program	3.1	6.3	17.8	43.8	29.0
14. develop productive co-sponsorship relationships	8.8	15.2	36.3	30.6	9.0
15. develop inter-agency referral relations	6.9	11.8	32.2	35.6	13.5
16. develop counseling services	4.6	12.8	34.5	36.1	12.0
17. provide transportation for students	15.4	24.1	22.0	21.7	16.7

Section IV: Program Management (Cont.)

	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT: PRIORITY OF NEED YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highe Prior
13.7*	19. evaluate overall program effectiveness	0.7	7.1	26.6	44.2	21.
	20. utilize community advisory boards	5.9	22.0	35.6	28.7	7.
	21. involve community setting program goals and priorities	5.6	17.5	35.4	31.5	10.
	22. involve students in setting program goals and priorities	2.7	10.0	31.0	41.2	15.
	23. involve staff in setting program goals and priorities	2.3	9.3	26.9	47.4	14.
	24. Other (specify: _____)	79.1	2.2	2.2	5.5	11.

Section V: Recruitment

	RECRUITMENT: PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
1.	determine what groups in the community need ABE	3.4	13.0	24.2	40.1	19.3
2.	evaluate the student recruitment effort	2.0	10.9	31.8	41.5	13.8
3.	use professional ABE staff with other primary responsibilities in the recruitment effort	3.0	10.4	31.2	39.9	15.5
4.	use paraprofessionals as recruiters	8.8	13.7	26.9	34.4	16.2
5.	work through other agencies to recruit students	3.4	5.1	21.8	45.0	24.8
6.	use television and radio spots	8.1	14.9	28.8	33.7	14.5
7.	use other media, e.g., newspaper, posters	3.4	11.2	27.7	40.5	17.1
8.	other (specify:_____)	61.8	3.3	4.1	14.6	16.3
	Recruit these specific groups:					
21.5* 9.	most illiterate	2.1	6.0	14.4	32.3	45.1
10.	young males	3.9	8.7	26.5	41.1	19.8
11.	unemployed	3.9	3.8	15.8	46.1	30.4
12.	non-English speaking	30.1	12.7	15.5	24.3	17.5
13.	Blacks	24.7	10.8	16.9	25.4	22.2
14.	Mexican-Americans	53.1	12.1	8.4	14.7	11.6
15.	Puerto Ricans	64.8	15.2	8.9	6.5	4.6
16.	Indians	62.8	13.7	8.2	7.5	7.8
17.	Asians	60.0	16.9	13.1	7.3	2.7
18.	rural adults	14.7	8.8	14.7	33.1	28.6
19.	urban adults	25.7	6.5	15.4	31.9	20.4
20.	migrants	52.2	15.2	13.5	11.7	7.4
21.	other group (specify:_____)					

Section VI: In-Service Education

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
1. find out staff needs for in-service education	2.1	9.2	29.6	37.7	21.4
2. motivate staff participation in in-service education	2.4	13.6	24.9	41.0	18.2
3. evaluate in-service education programs	2.8	9.9	32.6	40.2	14.5
Use the following activities as part of the in-service education effort:					
4. local workshops	2.2	9.3	25.0	40.7	22.9
5. work in the classroom of a more experienced teacher	5.4	17.2	33.9	34.0	9.6
6. participation in curriculum development	2.7	6.9	33.1	44.2	13.1
7. coaching of less experienced staff	5.3	15.6	37.6	34.2	7.2
8. state and regional education programs	2.7	13.0	30.2	39.6	14.5
9. college and university courses	5.6	25.1	28.1	30.3	10.9
10. other activity (specify:_____)	78.0	2.5	6.8	4.2	8.5
Provide in-service education for:					
11. teachers	1.2	5.2	12.9	37.6	43.1
12. paraprofessionals	12.0	9.4	23.4	35.5	21.8
13. counselors	12.1	11.7	24.7	33.7	17.8
14. supervisors	7.4	13.0	23.4	36.5	19.7

Section VI: In-Service Education (Cont.)

	IN-SERVICE EDUCATION: PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
	Provide in-service education concerning:					
	15. adult learning and development	1.7	5.7	23.6	42.5	26.4
	16. understanding the student population	2.6	10.8	31.3	39.8	15.5
	17. instructional methods	1.7	4.2	22.3	48.5	23.3
	18. instructional materials (selecting, adapting, and using)	1.4	5.8	24.6	46.5	21.8
	19. use of instructional technology (e.g., audio-visual equipment, controlled reader, Aud-X)	2.9	13.7	37.6	33.7	12.1
18.5*	20. diagnosis of student learning needs	1.1	3.5	17.2	42.6	35.6
	21. evaluation of student achievement	1.4	3.7	25.6	47.7	21.6
	22. working with aides and volunteers	9.7	15.0	38.3	30.5	6.4
	23. teaching "coping" skills (e.g., how to apply for a job)	2.1	10.0	35.5	39.8	12.6
	24. counseling students	2.7	10.1	28.7	43.5	15.0
	25. other (specify: _____)	86.0	4.0	3.0	5.0	2.0

Section VII: Instruction

	INSTRUCTION: PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
1.	orient new students to program	1.6	10.6	34.3	39.5	14.0
2.	diagnose student learning needs	0.6	4.9	15.4	45.4	33.8
3.	prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs	0.7	2.8	13.3	44.3	38.9
4.	foster student participation in setting objectives and evaluating learning activities	1.0	6.5	29.4	45.8	17.4
5.	increase student motivation	0.4	5.2	13.9	47.2	33.3
6.	build student self-confidence	0.3	2.8	14.3	49.7	32.9
7.	teach "coping" skills (e.g., how to apply for a job)	1.1	7.9	35.8	40.9	14.2
8.	evaluate student progress	0.8	5.5	31.5	45.4	16.8
17.8* 9.	retain students in program	1.2	3.4	13.9	34.0	47.5
10.	minimize disruption due to continuous enrollment of new students	4.8	20.1	35.2	28.3	11.5
11.	use ABE teachers to counsel students	2.4	15.1	32.5	40.6	9.4
12.	place students in jobs or training programs	6.1	14.5	25.4	34.9	19.0
13.	evaluate instructional program	1.4	5.1	26.7	46.6	20.2
14.	use methods appropriate to adults	0.8	6.6	18.1	44.4	30.1
15.	key curriculum to behavioral objectives	2.0	9.5	28.2	40.9	19.4

Section VII: Instruction (Cont.)

INSTRUCTION: PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
Use the following in the instructional process:					
16. paraprofessionals in instructional roles	12.6	16.6	36.9	27.0	6.8
17. small group instruction	1.9	9.8	31.5	38.1	18.6
18. programmed materials	2.5	14.6	31.2	37.7	14.0
19. learning laboratory	5.9	13.4	31.4	33.1	16.2
20. educational television	16.7	26.6	35.9	16.1	4.7
21. other instructional technology (e.g., controlled reader, Aud-X)	6.6	19.0	38.6	28.7	7.0
22. home instruction	17.6	25.6	31.7	18.3	6.8
23. out-of-classroom experiences e.g., field trips	11.0	21.8	34.3	26.6	6.2
24. simulated learning situations e.g., role playing, games	6.3	22.4	34.4	28.3	8.6
25. other (specify:_____)	81.2	5.9	5.9	4.0	3.0

Section VIII: Instructional Materials

	INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS: PRIORITY OF NEED FOR YOUR PROGRAM TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
	1. identify and locate instructional materials	1.0	10.8	31.4	37.7	19.1
13.6*	2. provide dependable information on quality and applicability of instructional materials	1.4	7.1	25.8	44.1	21.6
	3. adapt materials for local use	1.5	9.0	27.9	44.9	16.7
	4. develop new materials locally for local use	2.6	13.2	30.7	36.3	17.2
	5. other (specify:_____)	77.5	5.9	4.9	5.9	5.9
	Develop more effective adult oriented materials for instruction in:					
17.9*	6. beginning reading (levels 1-3)	1.0	9.7	19.9	37.4	32.1
	7. intermediate reading (levels 4-6)	0.6	7.1	23.4	45.2	23.7
	8. advanced reading (levels 7-8)	1.7	9.3	30.6	36.3	22.1
	9. beginning mathematics (levels 1-3)	1.7	11.3	29.4	39.1	18.5
	10. intermediate mathematics (levels 4-6)	1.6	9.2	31.5	41.6	16.1
	11. advanced mathematics (levels 7-8)	2.2	12.2	32.4	35.7	17.6
	12. consumer education	2.1	8.1	25.3	42.0	22.4
	13. health education	2.9	11.9	34.0	36.9	14.4
	14. family life education	3.1	11.3	29.4	37.2	19.0
	15. "coping" skills (e.g., how to apply for a job)	2.4	11.4	30.5	38.9	16.8
	16. civics	2.7	13.5	43.2	33.7	6.8
	17. ethnic heritage	6.9	20.0	42.2	25.0	5.9
	18. English as a Second Language	24.4	15.5	17.2	25.4	17.5
	19. other (specify:_____)	75.7	1.9	3.7	8.4	10.3

APPENDIX II-C

FACSIMILE OF TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE: MARGINALS

The following pages are facsimile reproductions of the questionnaire sent to teachers.

For every item, the percentages of teachers who assigned each priority or who indicated that the item was inapplicable are recorded. Non-respondents are excluded from the percentages.

For every section, respondents were instructed to check the number of the ONE item which was their single highest (TOP) priority. Where 12.5% or more of teachers concurred in nominating an item as the single TOP priority item in that section, this is reported here by an asterisk next to the item number. The percent of teachers so nominating the item is given to the left of the asterisk.

Section I: General Pricrities

	PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE PROGRAM PRACTICE IN EACH OF THESE PROGRAM AREAS:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priorit
28.4*	1. recruitment	5.2	10.0	19.8	29.3	35.7
	2. in-service education	2.0	13.4	30.7	39.5	14.4
19.1*	3. instruction	0.8	7.5	17.0	39.6	35.1
25.6*	4. instructional materials	0.5	4.9	16.0	38.9	39.7
	5. use of paraprofessionals	10.2	24.6	33.3	25.3	6.7
	6. counseling	4.6	16.9	29.7	34.5	14.3
	7. learning labs	6.4	17.0	26.0	32.7	17.9

Section II: Instruction

	PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS FOR TEACHERS TO:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
	1. orient new students to program	2.9	20.3	33.4	29.4	14.1
	2. diagnose student learning needs	0.7	5.4	19.1	40.4	34.3
11.8*	3. prescribe learning activities to meet individual needs	0.9	4.2	14.6	37.7	42.5
	4. foster student participation in setting learning objectives	1.7	14.3	28.0	42.0	14.0
	5. foster student participation in evaluating learning activities	1.9	12.4	29.8	42.7	13.1
	6. increase student motivation	1.9	8.7	15.8	38.8	34.8
	7. build student self-confident	0.2	2.4	14.5	39.9	43.0
	8. evaluate student progress	1.0	9.7	29.1	46.8	13.3
	9. minimize disruption due to continuous enrollment of new students	10.4	23.7	29.0	22.2	14.7
	10. minimize disruption due to student absences	8.3	17.7	27.7	31.8	14.6
	11. counsel students in academic or personal matters	5.7	15.6	34.2	28.7	15.8
	12. promote student placement in jobs or training programs	13.1	10.7	22.1	26.4	27.8

Section II: Instruction (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS FOR TEACHERS TO:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
13. refer students for needed social services	11.7	17.4	27.9	30.5	12.4
14. evaluate instructional program	1.2	10.3	29.1	43.9	15.5
15. foster student socialization	10.0	31.3	33.7	19.7	5.3
16. key curriculum to behavioral objectives	6.5	24.6	30.8	28.2	9.9
PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO TEACH:					
17. beginning reading (1 - 3)	12.2	9.1	17.2	24.9	36.6
18. intermediate reading (4 - 6)	10.5	7.4	16.3	41.1	24.4
19. advanced reading (7 - 8)	9.2	7.5	23.8	36.3	23.1
20. writing skills	5.3	8.4	25.1	41.1	20.1
21. speaking and listening skills	2.4	7.1	20.0	41.2	29.3
22. computational skills	5.3	6.7	26.4	42.0	19.7
23. consumer education	8.6	8.2	28.1	37.2	18.0
24. health education	10.0	13.2	29.2	34.4	13.2
25. family life education	10.5	12.4	30.8	29.8	16.5
26. civic skills	7.7	11.1	35.8	33.2	12.3

Section II: Instruction (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO TEACH:	Your Current Priority				
	Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
27. "coping"skills (e.g., how to apply for a job.	7.4	9.0	21.6	34.0	28.0
28. ethnic heritage	16.8	22.9	30.2	19.7	10.5
29. English as a Second Language	30.5	9.4	15.6	20.0	24.5
30. other (specify)_____	66.3	1.1	4.2	13.7	14.7
PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS FOR TEACHERS TO USE:					
31. paraprofessionals in instructional roles	16.3	22.1	29.9	25.3	6.3
32. pairs or small groups of students to practice skills	4.3	16.8	33.3	32.9	12.7
33. small groups to engage in problem solving	5.5	18.5	31.2	34.1	10.8
34. individual tutoring	3.2	11.9	24.0	34.0	26.9
35. self-instruction	1.7	15.0	25.6	40.6	17.1
36. team teaching	20.1	15.3	28.4	25.2	10.9
37. resource persons from the community	9.2	17.4	30.2	29.5	13.8
38. programmed materials	3.1	12.0	26.5	34.5	23.9
39. learning laboratory	8.2	14.0	23.4	33.3	21.0
40. educational television	21.0	21.5	25.8	20.5	11.1
41. other instructional technology (e.g., Controlled Reader, Aud-X)	10.2	17.1	28.5	30.2	13.9

Section II: Instruction (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS FOR TEACHERS TO USE:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
42. home instruction	19.9	21.1	28.7	20.4	9.8
43. out-of-classroom experiences (e.g., field trips)	17.8	20.9	26.4	23.6	11.3
44. simulated learning situations (e.g, role playing, games)	16.1	24.1	26.0	21.9	11.8
45. other (specify)_____	76.3	0	6.8	10.2	6.8

AFTER assigning a priority rating to each of the items above, please make a checkmark in from of the ONE item in Section II which is your HIGHEST PRIORITY for an experimental or demonstration project concerning instruction.

Section III: In-service Education

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Your Current Priority				
	Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
1. find out the need of potential participants	3.1	6.2	16.9	37.8	36.1
2. plan the content of the in-service program	4.6	11.0	24.9	40.3	19.2
3. design the format of the in-service program	4.1	14.3	34.2	33.7	13.6
4. avoid content duplication among in-service programs which you attend.	6.3	14.0	24.6	31.8	23.4
5. select instructors for the in-service program	7.7	14.9	25.5	33.5	18.3
6. train instructors for the in-service program	7.5	13.9	26.0	32.9	19.7
7. schedule in-service education activities	6.7	14.5	30.4	32.8	15.7
8. re-imburse or otherwise reward participants	9.3	16.0	26.0	26.3	22.4
9. follow up after the formal in-service program	6.0	10.6	26.3	38.2	18.8
10. evaluate the in-service program	6.0	11.6	21.7	39.1	21.5
11. train teachers	7.7	8.7	20.3	31.2	32.0
12. train paraprofessional	13.9	14.4	22.5	29.7	19.5
13. train supervisors	13.3	15.4	22.7	28.7	20.0
14. train counselors	15.4	13.2	20.7	30.5	20.2

Section III: In-Service Education (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO USE:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
15. local workshops	5.7	13.4	27.7	32.7	20.5
16. work in the classroom of a more experienced teacher	10.4	16.7	28.0	31.3	13.6
17. participation in curriculum development	5.0	13.0	24.3	39.1	18.5
18. coaching of less experienced staff	10.3	19.1	34.3	26.4	9.8
19. state and regional education program	8.7	18.6	26.7	31.3	14.8
20. college and university courses	8.3	17.2	25.8	31.6	17.2
21. independent study; self-instruction	5.9	16.1	30.9	32.1	15.1
22. other activity (specify)_____	64.8	8.8	12.1	7.7	6.6
PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE IN-SERVICE PROGRAM CONCERNING:					
23. ABE program objectives, current operations	2.8	15.3	30.0	37.8	14.3
24. adult learning and development	1.5	5.5	24.8	42.8	25.5
25. philosophy of adult education	3.0	18.6	30.7	33.9	13.8

Section III: In-Service Education (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS CONCERNING:	Your Current Priority				
	Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
26. understanding the student population	2.8	15.8	26.8	32.8	22.0
27. methods of instruction	1.0	5.8	18.1	37.9	37.2
28. instructional materials (selecting, adapting and using)	0.8	4.8	14.0	38.0	42.5
29. use of instructional technology (e.g., audio visual equipment, Controlled Reader, Aud-X)	3.3	10.0	25.0	35.3	26.5
30. diagnosis of student learning needs	1.0	7.5	14.4	35.1	42.0
31. student program description	2.5	12.3	42.1	34.1	9.0
32. evaluation of student achievement	0.7	8.0	27.6	45.5	18.2
33. building student self-confidence	0.7	4.7	15.3	34.2	45.0
34. working with aides and volunteers	11.4	21.4	32.8	24.6	9.7
35. use of learning lab	11.4	15.4	24.8	32.0	16.4
36. selecting methods appropriate for individual students	1.0	5.5	13.5	39.8	40.3
37. selecting objectives appropriate for individual students	1.8	7.3	18.0	40.3	32.8

Section III: In-Service Education (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS CONCERNING:	Your Current Priority				
	Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
38. counseling students in academic or personal matters	5.5	13.5	28.6	34.6	17.8
39. promoting student placement in jobs or training programs	14.1	10.1	21.1	30.2	24.6
40. referring students for needed social service	13.0	14.2	30.9	27.9	14.0
41. student recruitment	6.4	7.6	19.7	26.4	39.9
42. student retention	8.6	8.1	19.7	26.8	36.9
43. improving teacher-student relations	5.5	18.7	27.2	28.7	20.0
44. improving staff relations	12.5	24.8	24.8	26.1	11.8
PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION ON HOW TO TEACH:					
45. beginning reading (1 - 3)	10.8	12.0	13.9	26.7	36.7
46. intermediate reading (4 - 6)	8.9	7.7	19.3	42.2	22.0
47. advanced reading (7 - 8)	8.0	9.3	23.8	37.0	22.0
48. computational skills	5.7	7.9	26.5	39.6	20.3
49. consumer education	8.4	9.7	31.5	33.0	17.4
50. health education	8.8	15.4	30.6	32.6	12.5
51. family life education	9.9	15.6	29.2	30.2	15.1

Section III: In-Service Education (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE IN-SERVICE EDUCATION ON HOW TO TEACH:	Your Current Priority				
	Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
52. ethnic heritage	17.5	23.9	27.7	22.9	8.0
53. civic skills	9.7	14.2	30.9	33.2	12.0
54. "coping" skills (e.g., how to apply for a job)	7.2	10.2	21.6	35.5	25.6
55. English as a Second Language	29.1	10.1	14.8	22.4	23.6
56. other (specify) _____	67.9	2.5	6.2	16.0	7.4

AFTER assigning a priority rating to each of the items above, please place a check mark in front of the ONE item in Section III which is your HIGHEST priority for an experimental or demonstration project concerned with In-Service Education.

Section IV: Counseling

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEOMSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAY TO:	Not Applic-cable	Your Current Priority			
		Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority
12.8*1. orient new student to program	3.2	15.7	29.2	30.7	21.2
2. provide academic counseling for students	4.7	11.9	31.8	33.1	18.4
3. provide personal counseling for students	5.5	13.9	29.9	31.8	18.9
4. refer students who need social services	7.0	17.5	31.8	31.3	12.3
5. provide vocational counseling for students	7.4	11.9	23.0	36.6	21.0
6. refer students who need placement services	7.9	13.2	28.3	34.0	16.6
12.8* 7. place students in jobs or training program	11.8	12.3	19.8	30.1	26.1
8. develop more effective working relations with other agencies serving the student population	7.7	10.9	25.1	33.5	22.8
9. use professional counselors to provide counseling	8.5	17.0	27.9	25.9	20.7
10. use teachers to provide counseling services	7.0	20.9	31.7	29.9	10.5
11. develop more effective working realtions among ABE staff members who provide counseling services	12.5	16.5	27.6	32.1	11.3

Section IV: Counseling

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
12. utilize group counseling	13.7	20.3	34.4	22.3	9.4
23.8* 13. follow up on drop outs	5.1	7.4	18.9	37.7	30.9
14. keep student personnel records	5.2	23.2	28.4	29.2	14.0
15. other (specify)_____	73.5	4.4	7.4	7.4	7.4

AFTER assigning a priority rating to each of the items above, please place a check mark in front of the ONE item in Section IV which is your HIGHEST priority for an experimental or demonstration project concerned with Counseling.

Section V: Instructional Materials

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority: Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
1. identify and locate instructional materials	2.4	7.2	23.9	38.0	28.5
2. provide dependable information on quality and applicability of instructional materials	2.0	5.4	20.8	40.3	31.5
3. adapt materials for local use	2.9	5.8	23.1	38.6	29.6
4. develop new materials locally for local use	2.2	12.0	24.9	30.1	30.8
5. other (specify)_____	70.6	4.4	7.4	7.4	10.3
PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO DEVELOP MORE EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN:					
6. beginning reading (1 - 3)	10.5	9.2	15.5	24.7	40.1
7. intermediate reading (4 - 6)	9.3	6.0	19.1	39.7	25.9
8. advanced reading (7 - 8)	8.7	7.4	21.2	34.4	28.3
9. beginning mathematics (1 - 3)	11.5	12.8	22.6	29.6	23.6
10. intermediate mathematics (4 - 6)	9.0	9.3	20.0	40.5	21.3
11. advanced mathematics (7 - 8)	9.0	9.6	24.8	28.4	28.2
12. consumer education	9.1	10.1	29.6	30.9	20.3

Section V: Instructional Materials

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN:	Not Applicable	Your Current Priority			
		Priority	Priority	Priority	Priority
13. health education	9.8	13.3	30.7	33.7	12.6
14. family health education	10.5	12.3	32.5	31.8	13.0
15. civic skills	9.0	13.8	31.4	33.9	11.8
16. ethnic heritage	17.3	23.7	28.9	21.6	8.5
17. "coping" skills (e.g., how to apply for a job)	7.8	10.8	24.3	32.3	24.8
18. English as a Second Language	27.8	11.6	14.9	19.7	26.0
19. other (specify) _____	71.6	2.5	6.2	7.4	12.3
PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO DEVELOP MORE EFFECTIVE ADULT ORIENTED MATERIALS FOR USE BY:					
20. Blacks	28.9	12.2	15.9	21.3	21.8
21. Mexican Americans	38.1	9.7	13.3	16.9	22.0
22. Puerto Ricans	50.3	13.7	13.7	12.4	10.0
23. Indians	48.7	12.3	12.3	13.1	13.6
24. Asians	49.7	14.3	14.0	14.3	7.7
25. Urban adults	20.6	10.6	16.5	31.2	21.1
26. Rural adults	17.0	8.9	13.7	32.9	27.6
27. Migrants	40.3	7.3	14.4	20.9	17.0

210

Section V: Instructional Materials (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO DEVELOP MORE EFFECTIVE ADULT ORIENTED MATERIALS FOR USE BY:	Your Current Priority				
	Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
28. Unemployed	11.5	6.2	14.0	31.2	37.2
29. Least literate	9.9	7.7	17.9	30.9	33.7
30. Welfare recipients	11.9	6.3	20.5	31.1	30.1
31. Other group (specify) _____	57.9	3.3	5.0	5.8	28.1

AFTER assigning a priority rating to each of the items above, please place a check mark in front of the ONE item in Section V which is your HIGHEST PRIORITY for a experimental and demonstration project concerning instructional materials.

Section VI: Paraprofessionals

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF YOUR ABE PROGRAM HAS PARA-PROFESSIONALS ON ITS STAFF.

	PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO USE PARAPROFESSIONAL FOR:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
27.5*	1. student recruitment	8.1	11.2	20.8	28.5	31.5
	2. student orientation	7.8	14.8	30.5	31.3	15.6
	3. student follow-up	8.5	8.1	23.6	36.4	23.3
	4. counseling	14.3	22.5	26.0	26.0	11.2
22.2*	5. instruction - tutorial	6.2	7.7	21.5	38.1	26.5
	6. instruction - group work	5.7	8.7	24.7	36.9	24.0
	7. instruction - class	8.8	15.3	26.4	30.3	19.2
	8. materials preparation	5.4	11.2	17.0	37.8	28.6
	9. child care	25.3	14.4	23.3	21.4	15.6
	10. other (specify) _____	74.5	1.8	7.3	9.1	7.3

AFTER assigning a priority rating to each of the items above, please place a check mark in front of the ONE item in this section which is your HIGHEST priority for an experimental or demonstration project concerned with para-professionals.

212

Section VII: Learning Labs

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF STUDENTS IN YOUR ABE PROGRAM RECEIVE ALL OR PART OF THEIR INSTRUCTION IN A LEARNING LAB.

Section VII: Learning Labs PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Your Current Priority Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
1. use the learning lab to provide remedial work	8.5	10.1	22.2	37.0	22.2
2. use the learning lab to provide practice	8.1	7.6	27.0	38.4	18.9
3. use the learning lab to provide instructional variety	7.5	9.1	19.8	38.5	25.1
4. coordinate work in the lab and classroom, where primary emphasis is on classroom instruction	11.2	9.0	23.4	36.2	20.2
5. coordinate individual in the learning lab and group instruction, where primary emphasis is on individual work	8.9	7.8	17.7	41.7	24.0
6. orient student in use of learning lab.	8.6	12.4	21.0	39.2	18.8
7. prescribe appropriate learning program	7.0	9.1	18.8	32.8	32.3
8. provide needed tutorial assistance in the lab	7.9	13.2	21.1	36.8	21.1
9. ensure continuity and proper sequence in student learning activities	7.4	6.3	21.7	31.7	32.8
10. provide group struction when appropriate	7.5	7.5	26.7	39.0	19.3

Section VII: Learning Labs (Continued)

PRIORITY OF NEED YOU FEEL FOR PROJECTS TO FIND OR DEMONSTRATE MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO:	Your Current Priority: Not Applicable	Low Priority	Medium Priority	High Priority	Highest Priority
11. schedule student activities in the learning lab	9.2	15.1	28.6	31.9	15.1
12. record student activities and achievement	6.3	12.0	30.9	34.6	16.2
13. store and index instructional materials available in the learning lab	8.8	15.5	24.4	35.2	16.1
14.8*14. keep materials inventory complete and up-to-date	6.2	13.8	23.1	34.4	22.6
14.8*15. evaluate instructional effectiveness of lab	6.1	9.2	21.4	38.3	25.0
16. other (specify) _____	62.2	8.1	8.1	5.4	16.2

AFTER assigning a priority rating to each of the items above, please place a check mark in front of the ONE item in this Section which is your HIGHEST priority for an experimental or demonstration project concerned with learning labs.

Program #_____
(Please leave blank)

If you would like a summary of the results of this survey, fill in your name and address below.

Name_____

_____

_____zip_____